





ret.  
cont.

12/6



**Diatessarica**

PART II

THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR*

CLUE: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew  
Scripture (Diatessarica—Part I).

*Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d.*

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY:  
His Death and Miracles.

*In two Volumes, Demy 8vo, Cloth, with a  
Photogravure Frontispiece, Price 24s.*

AGENTS IN AMERICA

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Bibliot.  
Comment. in  
A.

Diatessarica — PART II

THE  
CORRECTIONS OF MARK

ADOPTED BY MATTHEW AND LUKE

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

189

"This and this have I learned. Thus and thus have I learned  
it. Go thou and learn better."


*Huxley's Life and Letters*, vol. ii. p. 301.

138791  
2016116

LONDON  
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK

1901





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

TO

**John Lightfoot**

AUTHOR OF THE HORAE HEBRAICAE

TOGETHER WITH TROMMIUS AND WETSTEIN

COMMENTATORS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

NOTABLE FOR THEIR APPLICATION OF JEWISH LEARNING

TO THE INTERPRETATION OF CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

BY THEIR DEBTOR

THE AUTHOR





## PREFACE

THE object of this book is to demonstrate that Mark contains a tradition from which Matthew and Luke borrowed, and to discuss the corrections of Mark jointly adopted by Matthew and Luke.

It is the Second Part of a projected series of works on the Gospels, and it assumes the conclusions of the First Part, which was entitled *Clue*.

The following pages will incidentally present a mass of evidence for the translation-hypothesis maintained in *Clue*. But there has been no attempt to select such Synoptic disagreements as would be best fitted to put that theory effectively before the reader. The object has been rather to furnish the student with the means of studying for himself the relations between the Gospels, and to enable him to confute the book, if he can, with the materials that the book itself supplies.

But, while neither denying nor regretting the appearance of weakness caused by this systematic non-selection, the author desires to point out that in a translation-hypothesis there is no room for the applica-

tion of the familiar saying, "A chain is not stronger than its weakest link." A moment's reflection will shew that, on the contrary, this kind of demonstration must be judged by its strongest instances. To repeat the example quoted in *Clue* (p. viii.): if two Greek documents that are in general agreement suddenly differ by mentioning, the one, "Idumaea," the other, "Syria," we should be led to suspect that the divergence arose from a Hebrew Original. "Idumaea" is in Hebrew אִדּוּמָא, and "Syria" is אֲרָם: and their similarity has caused the two to be repeatedly confused by the Greek Translators of the Old Testament. Three or four divergences capable of similar explanation would convince any reasonable person that they resulted from confusion of a Hebrew Original. And this conclusion would not be affected by the fact that many other divergences could be only doubtfully thus explained, and some not at all.

Take the book of Job, and compare the Greek text with the Hebrew. There are probably a hundred blunders where we can point to the exact confusion of the extant Hebrew words or letters that has led the translator astray. There are some hundreds more that can be only doubtfully thus explained, or that cannot be explained at all. There are a few passages where there is no Hebrew extant, and where Greek interpolation may be suspected. But no reasonable person doubts that the great majority of errors in Job

## PREFACE

---

proceeds from a misunderstanding of our Hebrew text, though we cannot at present in each case say what the misunderstanding was. Precisely the same argument holds good in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, as against the objection that "A few cases of divergence apparently, or even manifestly, arising from mistranslation, do not prove anything in the face of the larger number of divergences that cannot be thus explained." It would be truer to argue thus: "Six or seven cases of divergence explained by mistranslation suffice to shew that possible error from mistranslation must always be considered first in every attempt to explain divergent passages. And if, in the book of Job, even with the Hebrew in our hands, we cannot always detect the precise error that led the Greek translator wrong, it is unreasonable to expect that we should detect it in the Synoptic Gospels, where the Hebrew is not extant. By a careful classification of the certain causes of errors in Job, we find ourselves able to explain, from confusion of Hebrew, a good deal that at first seemed inexplicable from this cause. The same result, it is hoped, may be attained, in the case of the Synoptists, by classifying their agreements and disagreements in different portions of the Gospels, by comparing them with the remarkable variations found in the Codex Bezae, the Sinaitic Syrian, the Arabic Diatessaron, and other ancient authorities, and by reviewing the total result in the light of a collection

## THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK

---

of similar agreements and disagreements in the Greek renderings of the Hebrew old Testament."

---

To the friends that revised *Clue*, the author must again express his thanks for similar aid. In particular, he is indebted to Mr. W. S. Aldis for a close and searching criticism that resulted in many modifications and amplifications of the first draft of the work : and Professor W. H. Bennett was kind enough to inspect most of these additions, as well as the first proof, and to add several valuable suggestions.

WELLSIDE, HAMPSTEAD,  
16 MARCH 1901.

# CONTENTS

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	Page xvii
--	-----------

## BOOK I

### DOCUMENTARY PRIORITY

Introduction (273-5) . . . . .	Page 3
--------------------------------	--------

## CHAPTER I

### ABRIDGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

§ 1. The nature of the abridgments (276-7). § 2. The encompassing of Jericho (278). § 3. Parallel in Layamon's <i>Brut</i> (279) . . . . .	Page 5
--	--------

## CHAPTER II

### SAMUEL AND CHRONICLES

§ 1. Hebrew modification (280). § 2. David's reduction of the Philistines (280). § 3. Signs of posteriority in Chronicles (281). § 4. David's numbering of Israel (282). § 5. The tendency of the Chronicler's changes (283-4). § 6. The story of Araunah, or Ornan (285-6). § 7. The answer "by fire" (287-9) . . . . .	Page 10
--	---------



# THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK

---

## CHAPTER III

### DANIEL IN TWO VERSIONS

- § 1. The LXX both abridges and amplifies (290). § 2. The deciphering of the inscription by Daniel (291). § 3. The bearing of these extracts on Luke (292-3) . . . . . Page 20

## CHAPTER IV

### CHRONICLES, EZRA, AND ESDRAS

- § 1. King Josiah (294-5). § 2. The explanation of the Greek additions (296). § 3. The proclamation of Cyrus (297-9). § 4. The preface to a letter to the king of Persia (300-3). § 5. Fasting and praying (304-5) . . . . . Page 28

## CHAPTER V

### JUDGES IN TWO MANUSCRIPTS

- § 1. The Song of Deborah, in the Codex Vaticanus (B), and in the Codex Alexandrinus (A) (306-7). § 2. The difficulty of supposing that the author of A had B before him (308-9). § 3. The vengeance of Samson (310-1). § 4. Codex A less accurate again than B (312-3). § 5. Codex A, later on, more accurate than B (313) . . . . . Page 36

## CHAPTER VI

### PROOF OF MARK'S PRIORITY TO MATTHEW AND LUKE

- § 1. Unsafeness of argument from mere antecedent probability (314). § 2. Analogy between the versions and editions of parts of the Old Testament and parts of the New (315-7). § 3. The Triple Tradition and the Double Tradition in the Synoptic Gospels (318 (i)-(ii)). § 4. Conclusion from the phenomena of the Triple Tradition (319-21). § 5. Illustration of the relation between the Synoptists (322). § 6. The Corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke (323). § 7. Appeal to facts (324-6). § 8. The use of a complete table of the corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke (327-30) . . . . . Page 44



# CONTENTS

## BOOK II

### THE PRINCIPAL CORRECTIONS OF MARK<sup>1</sup>

- § 1. Arrangement (331-3). § 2. (Mk.) "the country of Judaea," (Mt.-Lk.) "the country round about Jordan" (334-5). § 3. (Mk.) "with the Holy Spirit," (Mt.-Lk.) "in (or, with) the Holy Spirit and with fire" (336-42). § 4. (Mk.) "rent," (Mt.-Lk.) "opened" (343). § 5. (Mk.) "casteth out," (Mt.-Lk.) "led" (344). § 6. (Mk.) "wild beasts," (Mt.-Lk.) "hungered" (345-6). § 7. (Mk.) "his brother," (Mt.) "two brothers," [(Lk.) "two boats"] (347-9). § 8. Mk.'s use of the word "proclaim" (350). § 9. (Mt.-Lk.) "Sir," om. by Mk. (351). § 10. (Mk.) "cometh" etc., (Mt.-Lk.) "behold" (352-3). § 11. (Mk.) "by four," (Mt.-Lk.) "on a bed" (354). § 12. (Mk.) "before them," (Mt.-Lk.) "to his house" (355-6). § 13. The Exclamatory Interrogative (357). § 14. (Mk.) "seweth on," (Mt.-Lk.) "putteth on" (358). § 15. The "wine-skins" (359-60). § 15 (a). (Mt.-Lk.) "eating," Mk. omits (360 (i)). § 16. (Mk.) "except," (Mt.-Lk.) "except alone" (361). § 17. (Mk.) "plagues," (Mt.-Lk.) "diseases" (362). § 18. The naming of the Apostles (363). § 19. (Mk.) "parables," (Mt.-Lk.) "thoughts" or "purposes" (364-6). § 20. The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (367-9). § 20 (a). (Mk.) "the (men) about him with the Twelve," (Mt.-Lk.) "the disciples" (370). § 21. (Mk.) "into them," (Mt.) "in his heart," (Lk.) "from their heart" (370-1). § 22. Interrogatives (372). § 23. (Mk.) "come," (Mt.) "light," (Lk.) "kindle" (373). § 24. (Mk.) "save that it may be," (Mt.-Lk.) "that shall not be" (373 (i)-(ii)). § 25. The mustard-seed (374-80). § 26. (Mk.) "they receive him," (Mt.-Lk.) "he went" (381). § 27. Jesus sleeping on "the cushion"; Mt.-Lk. differ (382-6). § 28. (Mk.) "feared," (Mt.-Lk.) "marvelled" (387). § 29. (Mk.) "his garment," (Mt.-Lk.) "the border of his garment" (388). § 30. (Mk.) "villages," (Mt.-Lk.) "cities and villages" (389-90). § 30 (i). The positive instructions to the Twelve (390 (i) (a)-(e)). § 30 (ii). The negative instructions to the Twelve (390 (ii) (a)-(e)). § 31. (Mt.-Lk.) Herod "the tetrarch," Mk. differs (391-3). § 32. (Mt.-Lk.) "withdrawing" or "drawing back," Mk. differs (394-9). § 33. (Mk.) "on foot," (Mt.) "followed on foot," (Lk.) "followed" (400). § 34. (Mk.) "teach," (Mt.) "cured," (Lk.) "healed" (401-3). § 34 (a). (Mk.) "five," (Mt.-Lk.) "not . . . save (or, more than) five" (403 (i)). § 35. (Mt.-Lk.) "that which superabounded," Mk. omits (404-5). § 36. (Mt.-Lk.) the "evil generation," Mk. omits "evil" (406-7). § 37. (Mt.-Lk.) "the

<sup>1</sup> This table gives merely the section headings. The subsections will often be found to contain discussions on very important points, either in the context, or in other parts of the Gospels illustrative of the context.

## THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK

sign of Jonah," Mk. omits (408-12). § 38. (Mk.) "look," (Mt.-Lk.) "give heed" (413). § 39. The confession of Peter (414-7). § 40. (Mk.) "after three days," (Mt.-Lk.) "on the third day" (418). § 41. The Transfiguration (419-21). § 42. (Mk.) "he knew not what to answer," (Mt.-Lk.) "while he was still speaking (or, saying these things)" (422-4). § 43. (Mk.) "faithless," (Mt.-Lk.) "faithless and perverse" (425). § 43 (a). (Mk.) "unto me," (Mt.) "to me . . . hither," (Lk.) "hither" (425 (i)). § 44. (Mk.) "is," (Mt.-Lk.) "is destined to be" (426-8). § 45. (Mk.) "first" and "last," Mt.-Lk. different (429-31 (ii)). § 46. "Salt" (432-7 (i)). § 46 (a). (Mt.-Lk.) "it came to pass . . . Galilee" (438 (i)-(v)). § 47. (Mk.) "with-lowering-countenance," (Mt.-Lk.) "heard" (439-42). § 48. (Mk.) "astonished," (Mt.-Lk.) "heard" (443). § 49. (Mk.) "cleft," (Mt.-Lk.) "hole" (444 (i)-(ii)). § 50. (Mk.) "a hundred-fold," (Mt.-Lk.) "manifold" (445-7 (iv)). § 50 (a). (Mk.) "after three days," (Mt.-Lk.) "on the third day" (447 (iv), see 418). § 51. (Mk.) "it was Jesus," (Mt.-Lk.) "Jesus was going, or passing, by" (448). § 52. (Mk.) "bring," (Mt.-Lk.) "lead" (449). § 53. (Mk.) "went forth," (Mt.-Lk.) "passed the night" (450-3). § 54. (Mk.) Interrogative, (Mt.-Lk.) Conditional (454). § 55. "Behold" and "behold!" (455-6). § 55 (a). (Mk.) "I will put a question," (Mt.-Lk.) "I, too, will question" (456 (i)-(iv)). § 56. (Mk.) "those," (Mt.-Lk.) "having seen" (457-8). § 57. (Mk.) "he will come," (Mt.-Lk.) "they say" (459-61). § 58. The Commandment-discussion (462-9). § 59. (Mk.) "in his teaching," (Mt.-Lk.) "disciples" (470). § 60. Walking "in robes" (471-2). § 61. The reply of Jesus to Judas (473-7). § 62. The wounding of the High priest's servant (478-82). § 63. (Mk.) "the Son of the Blessed," (Mt.-Lk.) "the Son of God" (483). § 64. (Mt.) "from this moment," (Lk.) "from the present time," Mk. omits (484-5). § 65. (Mt.-Lk.) "Who is it that struck thee?" Mk. omits (486-93). § 66. (Mk.) "was," (Mt.-Lk.) "sat" (493). § 67. Peter's three denials (494-8). § 68. (Mk.) (R.V.) "when he thought thereon," (Mt.-Lk.) "having gone out" (499-501). § 69. The Jews prefer Barabbas to Jesus (502-3 (iv)). § 69 (a). Possibilities of Greek corruption in the context (504). § 70. (Mk.) "bring," (Mt.-Lk.) "come" (505). § 71. (Mt.) "watched him (Lk. crucified him) there" (506). § 71 (a). (Mk.-Mt.) "his accusation," omitted by Lk. and Jn. (506 (i)-(iii)). § 72. The titles of Christ (507-8). § 73. The description of Christ's death (509-14). § 74. (Mk.) "he expired," (Mt.-Lk.) "coming to pass," or "came to pass" (514). § 75. (Mk.) "in Galilee," (Mt.-Lk.) "from Galilee" (515-6). § 76. Joseph of Arimathea (517-9). § 77. The burial of Jesus (520-1). § 78. (Mk.) "in a white robe," (Mt.-Lk.) ". . . lightning" (522-7). § 79. The end of Mark's Gospel—"for they feared" (528-33). § 80. Minor agreements of Matthew and Luke (534-41) , . . . . Page 61

## CONTENTS

---

### APPENDIX I

A COMPLETE TABLE OF THE CORRECTIONS IN GREEK . . .	Page 307
--	----------

### APPENDIX II

ORAL TRADITION . . . . .	Page 325
--------------------------	----------

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES . . .	Page 331
---------------------------------------	----------



## REFERENCES

- (i) *Black Arabic numbers*, e.g. (275), refer to subsections indicated in this volume or in the preceding one entitled *Clue*: subsections 1-272 belong to *Clue*: (275a) means a footnote on subsection 275.
- (ii) The Books of Scripture are referred to by the ordinary abbreviations, except where specified below. But when it is said that Samuel, Isaiah, Matthew, or any other writer, wrote this or that, it is to be understood as meaning *the writer, whoever he may be, of the words in question*, and not as meaning that the actual writer was Samuel, Isaiah, or Matthew.
- (iii) The MSS. known severally as the Alexandrian, the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Codex Bezae, are called by their usual abbreviations A,  $\aleph$ , B, and D. The Syriac version of the Gospels discovered by Mrs. Gibson on Mount Sinai is called in the text the "Syro-Sinaitic" or "Sinaitic Syrian," and in the notes is referred to as SS.
- (iv) The text of the Greek Old Testament adopted is that of Professor Swete ;<sup>1</sup> of the New, that of Westcott and Hort.

## ABBREVIATIONS

A and  $\aleph$ , see (iii) above.

B, see (iii) above.

Buhl = Buhl's edition of Gesenius, Leipzig, 1899.

Chr. = *Chronicles*.

<sup>1</sup> This differs greatly from that of most earlier editions, which are usually based on Codex A (33).



## THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK

---

D, see (iii) above.

Diatess. = The Arabic Diatessaron, sometimes called Tatian's, translated by Rev. H. W. Hogg, B.D., in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

Ency. = Black's *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

Esdras, the First Book of, is frequently called, in the text, Esdras.

Gesen. Oxf. = the edition of Gesenius now being published by the Clarendon Press.

Hawkins = Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*, Oxford 1899.

Heb. LXX = that part of the LXX of which there is an extant Hebrew Original.

Hor. Heb. = *Horae Hebraicae*, by John Lightfoot, 1658-74, ed. Gandell, Oxf. 1859.

K. = *Kings*.

leg. = (as in Tromm.) "legerunt," i.e. the LXX "read" so-and-so instead of the present Hebrew text.

Levy = Levy's *Neuhebraisches und Chaldaisches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1889.

L.S. = Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

Oxf. Conc. = *The Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint*.

S. = *Samuel*.

Schöttg. = Schöttgen's *Horae Hebraicae*, Dresden and Leipsic, 1733.

Sir. = the work of Ben Sira, i.e. the son of Sirach. It is commonly called Ecclesiasticus (see 20a). The original Hebrew has been edited, in part, by Cowley and Neubauer, Oxf. 1897; in part, by Schechter and Taylor, Camb. 1899.

SS, see (iii) above.

Tisch. = Tischendorf's New Testament.

Tromm. = Trommius' *Concordance to the Septuagint*.

Wetst. = Wetstein's *Commentary on the New Testament*, Amsterdam, 1751.

W. H. = Westcott and Hort's New Testament.



## EXPLANATIONS

---

(a) A bracketed Arabic number, following the sign =, and connecting a Hebrew and a Greek word, indicates the number of instances in which that Hebrew word is represented by that Greek word in the LXX—*e.g.* קרם = ἀναθεματίζω (13), ἐξολοθρεύω (23), ἀπόλλυμι (2).

(b) In cases where the verses of the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Revised Version, are numbered differently, the numbering of the Revised Version is, for the most part, given alone.



BOOK I  
DOCUMENTARY PRIORITY



## INTRODUCTION

[273]<sup>1</sup> IN a previous volume, entitled *Clue*, specimens were given, first of errors known to have been caused in the Greek Old Testament by translation from the Hebrew, and then of discrepancies and variations, in parallel passages from the Greek New Testament, capable of being explained in precisely the same way in which the discrepancies and variations in different versions and manuscripts of the Greek Old Testament had been explained. And the conclusion was reached that parts of the Synoptic Gospels are based on translations from a Hebrew document. Starting from this conclusion we have now to consider two distinct questions: Which of the three Synoptic Gospels is the earliest? Which is the closest to the Hebrew Original?

[274] Incidentally these questions have been touched on in *Clue*, and it has been shewn that the later translation of Daniel by Theodotion is closer to the Hebrew than the earlier one ascribed to the Seventy; that the free Hellenic<sup>2</sup> translation of Ezra, commonly called the First Book of Esdras, is probably, (32) from internal evidence, earlier, and certainly less accurate, than the closer Hebraic translation of Ezra printed in the Septuagint as the Second Book of Esdras; and that the Codex Alexandrinus, though later by a century or more than the purest text of the

<sup>1</sup> The number 273 starts from the last subsection of *Clue*, which was 272.

<sup>2</sup> "Hellenic" will be sometimes used to characterize the style of a LXX translation written in Greek of less Hebraic character than is customary in those books of the LXX which are known to be translations.

Septuagint (represented by the Codex Vaticanus), is often closer to the Hebrew than the latter. But only brief extracts were given from these versions: and the discussion of their differences was mostly restricted to the consideration of confusions of words and conflations.

[275] Now other questions will arise. For example, is brevity a proof of earliness or of lateness? And may a version that is in a considerable number of instances closer to the Hebrew be relied on as being always closer? Is a free Hellenic style always a sign of inaccuracy, and a Hebraic style of accuracy, in translation? The following extracts are intended not so much to answer these and other similar questions, as to prepare the reader not to answer them prematurely. A complete answer cannot be given until a very full Table has been constructed of the Septuagint phenomena. But a great deal will have been gained if readers are led to disabuse themselves of two or three superficial but very common fallacies, and to keep an open mind.



## CHAPTER I

### ABRIDGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

#### § 1. *The nature of the abridgments*

[276] THE following extracts from the book of Joshua, about the capture of Jericho, exhibit many omissions in the Septuagint. Some of the passages omitted may be described as Semitic repetitions. But the Greek also omits the command—which is not a repetition—to spend six days in encompassing Jericho, and a great deal about the “seven priests,” and every mention of the “rams’ horns.”

[277] Professor Bennett, in the *Polychrome Bible*, prints this narrative as one of a very composite nature; and, although the omissions of the Septuagint do not exactly coincide with any particular colour, they belong mostly to the passages coloured as being of late origin. Some traditions about the mixed Hebrew origins of the story may possibly in part account for the freedom with which the Septuagint has condensed it.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Polychrome Series*, Joshua, ed. Rev. W. H. Bennett. In a note on this passage, Professor Bennett says, “In J they compass the city once a day for 7 days (vi. 3, 10, 11); they shout at the command of Joshua. In E they compass the city 7 times on one day (vi. 4, 12, 13), rising early (vi. 12) in order to have plenty of time; the Ark and the priests are prominent, and the signal for shouting is given by the horn (vi. 5). There are also traces of a third story, used by E, according to which the signal, as in Ex. xix. 16, was given by a long (supernatural?) blast of a single horn. Accordingly vi. 5 and parts of vi. 7 and vi. 20 are ascribed to E<sup>1</sup>.”

“R<sup>J</sup>E and R<sup>D</sup> have done their best to combine the two accounts into a continuous narrative; and some one with musical enthusiasm, after the manner

§ 2. *The encompassing of Jericho*Joshua v. 13–vi. 12 (R. V.).<sup>1</sup>Joshua v. 13–vi. 12 (LXX  
literally translated).

[278] “(13) And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, [*and behold,*] there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? (14) And he said, [*Nay; but*] as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, [*and did worship,*] and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant? (15) And the captain of the Lord’s host said unto Joshua, Put off thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. [*And Joshua did so.*]

(vi. 1) (Now Jericho was straitly shut up [*because of the children of Israel*]: none

[278] “(13) And it came to pass, when Joshua was in Jericho, and (*i.e.* then) having looked up with his eyes he saw a man standing over against him, and the sword drawn in his hand: and having come to him Joshua said to him, ‘Ours art thou, or of the adversaries?’ (14) But he said to him ‘I as captain of the host of the Lord am now present.’ And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and said to him, ‘Master, what dost thou command thy servant?’ (15) And the captain of the Lord saith to Joshua, ‘Loose the shoe from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou now standest is holy.’

(vi. 1) And Jericho was shut up and fenced in, and no one was going out from

of Chronicles, has thrown in a perpetual blowing of horns, which would have rendered the horns useless as a signal, and is excluded by vi. 6 and vi. 16.”

<sup>1</sup> The bracketed italics in R.V. indicate roughly, the translation from the LXX more exactly, what the LXX omits.

went out and none came in.) (2) And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I [*have*] give[n] into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof and the mighty men of valour. (3) And ye shall compass [*the city*], [*all*] the men of war, going about [*the city once*]. [*Thus shalt thou do six days.*] (4) *And seven priests shall bear seven trumpets of rams' horns before the ark: and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets.*] (5) And it shall be, that when they make a [*long*] blast with the [*ram's horn, and when ye hear the sound of the*] trumpet, all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall go up every man straight before him. (6) And Joshua the son of Nun called the priests, and said unto them, [*Take up the ark of the covenant, and*] let seven priests

it nor in to it. (2) And the Lord said to Joshua, 'See, I give Jericho into thy hand, and the king thereof that is in it, being mighty-men in strength. (3) But do thou set round it the fighting men in a circle. (4) And it shall come to pass, when ye trumpet with the trumpet, let all the people together shout, (5) and at their shouting, the walls of the city shall fall of themselves and all the people shall enter in with a rush, each man straight before his face into the city.' (6) And Joshua the son of Navé went in to the priests, (7) and spake to them, saying 'Charge the people<sup>1</sup> to go round and compass the city, and let the fighting men pass along, armed, before the Lord: (8) and let seven priests having seven sacred trumpets pass along in like manner before the Lord and let them give the signal with all their might: and let the ark of the covenant of the Lord

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to say whether verses 8 and 9 in LXX are parallel to 6, 7, or 8, in R.V. Note that, in R.V. 7 (txt., not marg.) the *priests speak* to the people, but in LXX 7 *Joshua tells* the priests to speak to the people. Moreover, the statements of *fact* in R.V. 8, 9 appear as commands, not facts, in LXX 8, 9 (240-3).

bear seven trumpets [*of rams' horns*] before [*the ark of*] the Lord. (7) And they (or, he) said unto the people, Pass on, and compass the city, and let the armed men pass on before [*the ark of*] the Lord. (8) And [*it was so, that when Joshua had spoken unto the people, the*] seven priests bearing the seven trumpets [*of rams' horns*] before the Lord passed on, and blew with the trumpets: and the ark of the covenant of the Lord followed them. (9) And the armed men went before the priests [*that blew the trumpets*] and the rearward went after the ark, the priests blowing with the trumpets as they went. (10) And Joshua commanded the people, saying, Ye shall not shout, nor let your voice be heard, [*neither shall any word proceed out of your mouth*], until the day I bid you shout; then shall ye shout. (11) So [*he caused*] the ark of the Lord to compass [*the city, going about it*

follow. (9) But let the fighting men pass along before, and the priests, the rearward, behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, blowing the trumpets.' (10) But Joshua commanded the people, saying 'Shout not, nor let any man so much as hear your voice, until HE declare the day to shout aloud:<sup>1</sup> and then shall ye shout aloud.' (11) And having gone round, the ark of the covenant of God straightway went back into the camp, and (?he) lodged<sup>2</sup> there. (12) And on the second day, Joshua rose early, and the priests took up the ark of the covenant of the Lord."

<sup>1</sup> "HE (αὐτός)." The LXX perhaps took "to you (אליכם)" as "God (אלהים)" and reverentially substituted "HE."

<sup>2</sup> lit. "slept" ἐκοιμήθη, i.e. spent the night. The LXX may mean "(Joshua) slept," or "the ark . . . lodged."



*once: and they*] came into the camp and lodged [*in the camp*]. (12) And Joshua rose early in the morning, and the priests took up the ark of the Lord."

### § 3. *Parallel in Layamon's "Brut"*

[279] Similar omissions characterize large portions of the Septuagint version of Joshua. Many of them bear a close resemblance to the omissions in the later version of Layamon's *Brut*, which cuts out epic superfluities and repetitions, and occasionally spoils the metre in so doing. In Josh. viii. 1, 2 "I have given into thy hand the king of Ai [*and his people, and his city*] and his land; and thou shalt do to Ai [*and her king*] as thou didst to Jericho and her king; only (LXX and) the spoil [*there*]of [*and*] the cattle shall ye take," and in several other cases, it may be doubtful whether the omitted portions may not have been additions to the Hebrew text rightly rejected by the Septuagint. But in the following instance there can be hardly any doubt that the Greek translator is wrong. Joshua is addressing the sinner Achan, who has brought defeat on Israel (Josh. vii. 19): "[*My son*] give [*I pray thee*] glory to the Lord . . . and tell me [*now*] what thou hast done." The bracketed words are omitted by the Septuagint. Their omission is natural, for they sound, even to modern ears, strangely lenient: their insertion, if they were not in the original narrative, would be most unnatural. In this last case, the Septuagint may be omitting, not for mere brevity, but for seemliness as well.



## CHAPTER II

### SAMUEL AND CHRONICLES

#### § 1. *Hebrew modification*

THE last chapter (277) touched on the possibilities of different strata of Hebrew documents, some of which might conceivably affect the Septuagint. To illustrate such possibilities it will be useful to compare one or two passages in Chronicles (R.V.) with their parallels in Samuel (R.V.). It is known that Chronicles is later than Samuel. The first extract describes David's conquest of Moab :

#### § 2. *David's reduction of the Philistines*

2 S. viii. 1-5.

[280] "(1) And after this it came to pass, that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them : and David took the bridle of the mother city<sup>1</sup> out of the hand of the Philistines. (2) And he smote Moab, and measured them with the line, making them to lie down on the ground ; and he measured two lines to put to death, and one

1 Chr. xviii. 1-5.

[280] "(1) And after this it came to pass, that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them, and took Gath and her towns out of the hand of the Philistines. (2) And he smote Moab, and

<sup>1</sup> Or, "Methegammah."

full line to keep alive. And the Moabites became servants to David, and brought presents. (3) David smote also Hadadezer the son of Rehob king of Zobah, as he went to recover his dominion at the River.<sup>1</sup> (4) And David took from him a thousand and seven hundred horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: and David houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them for an hundred chariots."

the Moabites became servants to David, and brought presents. (3) And David smote Hadarezer king of Zobah unto<sup>2</sup> Hamath, as he went to stablish his dominion by the river Euphrates. (4) And David took from him a thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: and David houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them for an hundred chariots."

### § 3. *Signs of posteriority in Chronicles*

[281] Here Chronicles, even if we had not known it to be later than Samuel, would have been stamped as such by its explaining the difficult expression "the Bridle of the Mother City," indicating the territory of the king of Zobah (or the place of his defeat), and inserting "Euphrates" to define "the River." The Chronicler omits the details of the slaughter of Moab, perhaps as being out of harmony with the ecclesiastical tone of his work.

### § 4. *David's numbering of Israel*

2 S. xxiv. 1-10.

1 Chr. xxi. 1-7.

[282] "(1) And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them,

[282] "(1) And Satan<sup>3</sup> stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel.

<sup>1</sup> Another reading is, "The river Euphrates."

<sup>3</sup> Or, "by."

<sup>3</sup> Or, "an adversary."

saying, Go, number Israel and Judah. (2) And the king said to Joab the captain of the host, which was with him, Go now to and fro through all the tribes 'of Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, and number ye the people, that I may know the sum of the people. (3) And Joab said unto the king, Now the Lord thy God add unto the people, how many soever they be, an hundred fold, and may the eyes of my lord the king see it: but why doth my lord the king delight in this thing? (4) Notwithstanding the king's word prevailed against Joab and against the captains of the host. And Joab and the captains of the host went out from the presence of the king, to number the people of Israel. (5) And they passed over Jordan, and pitched in Aroer.

. . . . .

. . . . .

. . (8) So when they had gone to and fro through all the land, they came to Jerusalem at the end of nine months and twenty days.

(9) And Joab gave up the

(2) And David said to Joab and to the princes of the people, Go,

number Israel from Beersheba even to Dan; and bring me word, that I may know the sum of them. (3) And Joab said, The Lord make his people an hundred times so many more as they be: but, my lord the king, are they not all my lord's servants? why doth my lord require this thing? why will he be a cause of guilt unto Israel? (4) Nevertheless the king's word prevailed against Joab. Wherefore Joab departed, and

went throughout all Israel and came to Jerusalem.

(5) And Joab gave up the

sum of the numbering of the people unto the king; and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men.

(10) And David's heart smote him after that he had numbered the people."

sum of the numbering of the people unto David. And all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and an hundred thousand men that drew sword: and Judah was four hundred threescore and ten thousand men that drew sword. (6) But Levi and Benjamin counted he not among them: for the king's word was abominable to Joab. (7) And God was displeased with this thing; therefore he smote Israel."

### § 5. *The tendency of the Chronicler's changes*

[283] Here the Chronicler condenses David's commands, and omits all the geographical details of the numbering of Israel and the time spent in the process. Joab's expostulation in Samuel is much more courtly than in Chronicles, which represents him as asking the king "why will he be a cause of guilt unto Israel?" More important than any of these differences is the substitution of "Satan stood up" for "the anger of the Lord was kindled." But they all reveal in the Chronicler a later writer, dealing freely with an earlier document, which he improves for the purpose of edification.

At the same time the Chronicler omits as superfluous "go to and fro throughout all the tribes of Israel." Instead of "Joab the captain (or, prince) of the host," he has "Joab and the princes of the people"—a less military and more constitutional expression.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Joab [even] the prince of the host" (2 S. xxiv. 2) may have been confused (237) with "Joab *and* the princes of the host" (2 S. xxiv. 4). In the parallel to the latter, Chr. has simply "Joab," in the parallel to the former, "Joab and the princes of the people."



[284] On the other hand Chronicles inserts in the statistics one or two additional statements—which, if true, would be of great importance—entirely altering the account of the military forces of Israel, and adding that Levi and Benjamin were not counted. Instead of the merely personal statement that “David’s heart smote him,” the Chronicler says that God “smote” the people.

§ 6. *The story of Araunah, or Ornan*

[285] In the following extract, that part which deals with Ornan seeing the angel, and Ornan’s four sons hiding themselves, has been discussed in *Clue* (106) where it was shewn that the variation probably originated in a mistake of the Chronicler who read “king” as being the similar word “angel.” But a more important difference is that the Chronicler inserts a statement, of which there is no vestige in Samuel, that the Lord *answered David from heaven by fire*.

2 S. xxiv. 18–26.

1 Chr. xxi. 18–28.

[286] “(18) And Gad came that day to David, and said unto him, Go up, rear an altar unto the Lord in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. (19) And David went up according to the saying of Gad, as the Lord commanded. (20) And Araunah looked forth, and saw the king and his servants coming on<sup>1</sup> toward him : and

Araunah went out, and bowed

[286] “(18) Then the angel of the Lord commanded Gad to say to David, that David should go up and rear an altar unto the Lord in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. (19) And David went up at the saying of Gad, which he spake in the name of the Lord. (20) And Ornan turned back, and saw the angel ; and his four sons that were with him hid themselves. Now Ornan was

<sup>1</sup> Or, “passing over.”



himself before the king with his face to the ground. (21) And Araunah said, Wherefore is my lord the king come to his servant ?

And David said, To buy the threshing-floor of thee, to build an altar unto the Lord, that the plague may be stayed from the people. (22) And Araunah said unto David, Let my lord the king take and offer up what seemeth good unto him : behold, the oxen for the burnt-offering, and the threshing instruments and the furniture of the oxen for the wood : (23) all this, O king, doth Araunah give<sup>1</sup> unto the king. And Araunah said unto the king, The Lord thy God accept thee. (24) And the king said unto Araunah, Nay, but I will verily buy it of thee at a price : neither will I offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord my God which cost me nothing. So David bought the threshing-floor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver. (25) And David built there

threshing wheat. (21) And as David came to Ornan, Ornan looked and saw David, and went out of the threshing-floor, and bowed himself to David with his face to the ground. (22) Then David said to Ornan, Give me the place of this threshing-floor, that I may build thereon an altar unto the Lord : for the full price shalt thou give it me : that the plague may be stayed from the people. (23) And Ornan said unto David, Take it to thee, and let my lord the king do that which is good in his eyes : lo, I give [thee] the oxen for burnt-offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood, and the wheat for the meal offering : I give it all.

(24) And king David said to Ornan, Nay ; but I will verily buy it for the full price ; for I will not take that which is thine for the Lord, nor offer a burnt-offering without cost. (25) So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight. (26) And David

<sup>1</sup> Or, "All this did Araunah the king give," etc.

an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.

So the Lord was intreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel."

built there an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, *and called upon the Lord; and he answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering.* And the Lord commanded the angel; and he put up his sword again into the sheath thereof."

### § 7. *The answer by fire*

[287] The alterations made by the Chronicler all tend in the direction of seemliness, or magnify the supernatural element. "Gad came and said" is altered into "the angel of the Lord commanded Gad to say." The space given in Samuel (xxiv. 21-23) to Araunah's utterances is partly devoted by the Chronicler to matters of fact. The price paid by the king for the altar is vastly increased ("fifty shekels of silver" changed to "six hundred shekels of gold"). "Calling on the Lord" is added to "burnt-offerings and peace-offerings." Lastly, instead of "the Lord was intreated and the plague was stayed," the Chronicler says that "the Lord answered him from heaven by fire" and "commanded the angel and he put up his sword."

[288] It may occur to many readers, who find it impossible to accept the "answer by fire" as a historical event, that their rejection of the narrative forces them to reject the narrator as absolutely dishonest: "How," they may ask, "could an event unique in David's life and extremely rare in Biblical History have been omitted by the earlier book of Samuel if there had been a vestige of tradition to support it? The Chronicler must in this case have invented without regard to tradition. It is not a textual corruption, but a deliberate fabrication."

But such reasoning ignores two important considerations, (i) the extent to which marginal notes and traditional comments, intended at first to be mere paraphrases or suggestions, creep into the text, where they become historical exaggerations; (ii) the general rule that miraculous stories in the Bible spring from poetry or metaphor misunderstood. For example, in the narrative of Araunah, where Samuel has "I will buy it at a price," editors or commentators might naturally say, "The king did not mean 'at a price,' which might mean a nominal price: he meant 'the *full* price.'" Then coming to the "fifty shekels of silver," and remembering that Abraham gave four hundred shekels for a burial-place, they might suggest that silver here must mean "money," as it often does. Subsequent editors, approving "money," would find it indefinite and would suggest (a) "gold," adding, perhaps, that "shekel," which has the meaning of "weight," here means (b) "by weight." Again, later tradition might suggest that one of these shekels was equal to several, perhaps twelve, ordinary shekels of silver, thus obtaining (c) "six hundred shekels." And this, being conflated with the above, might result in "(c) six hundred shekels (a) of gold (b) by weight." This may be called "growth," or "accretion," or whatever other synonym critics may select: but it is not "fabrication."

[289] As regards the "answer by fire," we must bear in mind that "fire" from the Lord is connected with the first sacrifice offered by Aaron as High-priest on the altar of burnt-offering, with the sacrifice of Gideon, with that of Elijah, and (in Chronicles, but not in Kings) with the first sacrifice offered in Solomon's temple.<sup>1</sup> Now it was a general belief among offerers of sacrifice that *the gods "ate"* the victims consumed on their altars, a belief preserved in Deuteronomy: "Where are their gods . . . which did *eat the fat of* their sacrifices?"<sup>2</sup> Against applying this belief

<sup>1</sup> Lev. ix. 24, Judg. vi. 21, 1 K. xviii. 38, 2 Chr. vii. 1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxxii. 38.



to Jehovah the prophets of Israel protested: and the Pentateuch never describes Him as "*eating* the fat," but only as "smelling a sweet savour" from it. However, the ancient belief appears to have left its mark on the Old Testament in the use of "bread" or "food" in such phrases as "the *food* of their God," and "of thy God," "my *food*," etc., meaning the sacrifices consumed by Jehovah.<sup>1</sup> The Septuagint, disliking this anthropomorphism, substitutes for "food," in many passages, "gifts." In Lev. iii. 11, "the *food-of* the-offering-made-by-fire unto the Lord," the LXX gives a paraphrase "a *savour of a sweet-smell*, a fruit-offering to the Lord," and again (Numb. xxviii. 24) "the *food of* the offering-made-by-fire," it has "a *gift*, a fruit-offering." Now a *burnt-offering when consumed by fire may be said in Hebrew to be "eaten" by the fire.*<sup>2</sup> Hence, some Hebrew traditions might distinguish special sacrifices such as those of Gideon, Elijah, and Solomon, by saying, not indeed that God "ate" them, but that fire from the Lord "ate" them, or that He sent the fire to "eat" them. By this the originator may have meant what modern writers might express by "accepted," or "accepted with a special acceptance": but it might be interpreted as meaning that fire came down visibly from heaven and consumed them. The story, being thus interpreted, would be amplified with explanatory details.

In later Jewish traditions, "fire" is frequently mentioned in quaint stories intended to enforce the belief that God is specially present at any sacred action such as the study of the Law. It is recorded of Jonathan ben Uzziel that his fire in the study of Thorah burned up the birds that flew over him; and Rabban Johanan and his disciples "read and expounded till the fire shone round about them as when

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17, etc. Gesenius, Oxf., compares also Numb. xxviii. 2, Ezek. xvi. 19, xlv. 7, Mal. i. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. vi. 10 "the ashes whereto the fire hath *consumed* (but lit. *eaten*) the burnt-offering," Deut. v. 25 "this great fire will *consume* us." The same word is used of "fire" in Is. v. 24, Nah. iii. 13 (R.V.) "devour."

the law was given at Mount Sinai."<sup>1</sup> In the Chronicler's account of Solomon's dedication of the Temple the descent of fire—omitted in the parallel Kings—may be nothing but a conflation of the statement in Kings that "the glory of the Lord" or "the cloud," *i.e.* the Shechinah, filled the house of the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

To return to the story of Araunah. Possibly a scribe, or editor, dissatisfied with the sober termination of Samuel, desired to emphasize the efficacy of the first prayer offered on the site of the new Temple; and, in suggesting, in the margin, "answered by fire," he may have meant little more than we should mean by saying that "God answered him with His glorious presence," or "vouchsafed His presence, and answered him in power." The insertion of such a tradition in the text may have been facilitated by a confusion between "fire" and "sacrifice by fire," which are very similar words.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Taylor's *Jewish Fathers*, i. 13 (2nd ed. p. 21); *Hor. Hebr.* on Acts i. 13; see also Schöttg. (on Acts ii. 3).

<sup>2</sup> 1 K. viii. 10, 11; 2 Chr. vii. 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> [289a] "Fire (ἔν)" and "fire-sacrifice (πῦρ)" are easily confused: comp. 1 S. ii. 28, "offerings," τοῦ πυρός, conversely Numb. xviii. 9 "from the fire," τῶν καρπωμάτων.

Hastings' *Dict. B.* ("Elijah" p. 688) speaks of "the lightning" as consuming Elijah's sacrifice, but says that the other story of the descent of fire on the captains of fifties (*ib.* 690) "can hardly be regarded as history."

See 2 Mac. i. 19-22 for Nehemiah's discovery of the sacred fire after the exile. In 2 Mac. x. 3, when Judas Maccabaeus purifies the Temple, it is said that the Jews built another altar πυρώσαντες λίθους, καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τούτων λαβόντες, a detail not found in the fuller account in 1 Mac. iv. 43-7.



## CHAPTER III

### DANIEL IN TWO VERSIONS

#### § 1. *The LXX both abridges and amplifies*

[290] THE following extracts from the Septuagint and from Theodotion's version of Daniel are selected as shewing that a version may abbreviate in one passage and amplify in another. Theodotion, throughout, practically adheres to our present Aramaic text: his translation is known to be later than that of the Septuagint.

#### § 2. *The deciphering of the inscription by Daniel*

Dan. v. 13—vi. 18 (LXX) (lit.).      Dan. v. 13—vi. 18 (Theod.) (lit.).

[291] "(13) Then Daniel was brought in unto the king,

[291] "(13) Then Daniel was brought in before the king, and the king said to Daniel, Thou art Daniel, the [man] from the children of the captivity of Judaea whom the king my father brought [hither]? (14) I have heard concerning thee that the spirit of God [is] in thee, and watchfulness and excellent wisdom hath been found in thee. (15) And now there have come in before me the

and the king answered and said to him, (16) O Daniel, canst thou show me the interpretation of the writing? And (*i.e.* then) I will array thee in a purple robe, and I will put a golden chain about thee, and thou shalt have authority over the third part

of my kingdom. (17) Then Daniel stood over against the writing, and read, and thus he answered the king,

This is the writing, It is numbered, it is reckoned, it is taken away; and the hand that wrote stood [still], and this is the interpretation of them. (23) O king,

wise men, enchanters, gazarenes, that they may read this writing and make known to me the interpretation thereof: and they could not declare [it] to me. (16) And I have heard concerning thee that thou canst interpret judgments: now therefore if thou canst read the writing, and makest known to me the interpretation thereof, thou shalt wear a purple robe, and the chain of gold shall be upon thy neck, and thou shalt rule in my kingdom [being] third. (17) And Daniel spake in the king's presence, Let thy gifts be to thyself: and the gift of thy house give thou to another: but I will read the writing, and will make known to thee the interpretation thereof. (18) O king, God the Most High gave to Nebuchadnezzar thy father the kingdom, and greatness, and honour and glory; (19) and because of the greatness that he gave him all the peoples, tribes, languages, trembled and were afraid before him: whom he would, he destroyed, and whom he would, he smote,

and whom he would, he doth raise up (*ὑψοῖ*, v.r. *-ov*), and whom he would he humbled. (20) And when his heart was lifted up and his spirit was hardened to deal proudly, he was brought down from his kingly throne, and his honour was taken from him, (21) and he was driven away from men, and his heart was given with the beasts (*i.e.* made like them), and with wild asses [was] his habitation, and they fed him with grass like an ox, and with the dew of heaven his body was wet, until he should know that God the Most High is lord of the kingdom of men, and will give it (*i.e.* the kingdom) to whosoever seemeth him good. (22) And thou therefore his son, Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart in the sight of God : thou knewest not all these things : (23) and thou hast been lifted up against the Lord God of heaven, and the vessels of his house thou didst bring before thee, and thou and thy nobles and thy concubines and thy wives drank wine therein, and thou didst

(23) . . . thou madest a feast for thy friends, and wast drinking wine, and the vessels of the house of the living God were brought to thee, and ye drank therein, thou and thy nobles, and ye

praised all the idols of men, made with hands, and to the Living God ye offered no blessing, and thy breath is in his hand, and [it is] he [that] gave thee thy kingdom, and thou didst not bless him, neither didst offer him praise.

(26) This is the interpretation of the writing, The time of thy kingdom hath been numbered, thy kingdom ceaseth.

(27) It hath been cut short and accomplished.<sup>1</sup>

(28) Thy kingdom is given to the Medes and to the Persians. (29) Then Belshazzar the king clothed Daniel in purple and put a chain of gold about him and

praise the gods of gold and silver and brass and iron and wood and stone, which see not, nor hear nor know; and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, him thou hast not glorified: (24) for this cause was the bone of the hand sent from before him and it set therein this writing. (25) And this is the writing that was set therein, Mané, Thekel, Phares. (26) This is the interpretation of the saying, Mané, God hath measured thy kingdom and brought it to fulfilment: (27) Thekel, it hath been weighed in the balance and found lacking: (28) Phares, thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians. (29) And Belshazzar spake, and they clothed Daniel with purple and put the chain of gold about his neck, and he made proclamation concerning him,

<sup>1</sup> [291a] Neither here, nor in v. 17, does the LXX mention the words "Mene, Tekel, etc.," but it gives them in a summary that precedes the story (coming before v. 1) thus: "In that same night there came forth fingers as it were of a man, and wrote upon the wall of his house, upon the plaster over against the lamp, Mané, Phares, Thekel: and the interpretation of them is—Mané, it hath been numbered. Phares, it hath been taken away. Thekel, it hath been weighed."



gave him authority over the third part of his kingdom. (30) And the judgment came upon Belshazzar the king, and the sovereignty was taken away from the Chaldaeans and given to the Medes and to the Persians. And Artaxerxes, he of the Medes, received the kingdom.

vi. (1) And Darius [was] full of days<sup>1</sup> and honoured in his old age, and he set a hundred and twenty-seven (*sic*) satraps over all his kingdom, (2) and over them three men that had leadership of them, and Daniel was one of the threemen, (3) having authority beyond all in the kingdom. And Daniel was clothed in purple, and great and honoured before Darius the king, according as he was honoured and a man of understanding and wisdom, and a holy spirit was in him, and he prospered in the business of the king which he dealt with. Then the king was purposed to set Daniel over all his kingdom, and the two men whom he set with him, and a hundred and twenty - seven satraps.

that he should be the third ruler in the kingdom. (30) In that very night Belshazzar the king of the Chaldaeans was slain, and Darius the Mede received the kingdom, being sixty-two years [old].<sup>1</sup>

vi. (1) And [it] was pleasing in the sight of Darius, and he set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty satraps, that they should be in the whole of his kingdom, (2) and above them three presidents, of whom Daniel was one, that the satraps should render account to them, in order that the king might not be troubled. (3) And Daniel was beyond them, for an excellent spirit was in him, and the king set him over the whole of his kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> Aram. "son of sixty-two years" (125).



(4) But when the king was purposed to set Daniel over all his kingdom, then the two young men counselled a counsel and purpose with themselves, saying to one another, since they found no sin nor fault-of-ignorance against Daniel concerning which they might accuse him to the king, (5) and they said, Come let us make a decree against ourselves (? καθ' ἐαυτῶν) that no man shall ask a petition or pray a prayer till thirty days from any God save only from Darius the king: else, he shall die: that they might get the better of Daniel before the king, and that he might be thrown into the den of lions. For they knew that Daniel prayed and besought the Lord his God thrice a day. (6) Then those men came and spake in the presence of the king, (7) We have established a decree and a statute that every man, whosoever shall pray a prayer or make a petition of any God until thirty days save of Darius the king, shall be thrown into the den of lions.

(4) And the presidents and satraps sought to find an occasion against Daniel. And they found no occasion nor transgression nor offence against him, because he was faithful. (5) And the presidents said, We shall not find any occasion against Daniel, except in the observances of his God.

(6) Then the presidents and the satraps stood by the king and said to him, King Darius, live for ever. (7) All those who are over thy kingdom, ministers and satraps, governors and magistrates, have consulted together to establish by royal statute and confirm a decree that whosoever shall ask a

petition of any god or man until thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions. (8) Now therefore, O king, establish the decree and publish a writing, that the ordinance of the Persians and Medes be not changed. (9) Then king Darius commanded that the ordinance should be put in writing. (10) And Daniel . . .

(9) And thus did king Darius establish and ratify. (10) But Daniel . . .

### § 3. *The bearing of these extracts on Luke*

[292] It will be seen that the Septuagint omits a good deal of discourse about Nebuchadnezzar that might seem not to the point, and some more discourse that might seem tedious. It omits Daniel's verbal rejection of the king's gifts—presumably because the narrative goes on to say that Daniel actually received them. It mentions the actual words of the mysterious writing in a short preface to the narrative, but not in the narrative itself.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it is fuller on the jealousy and plotting of Daniel's colleagues, who are described as saying "Come, let us make a decree"; and are said to "*have* established" it, whereas Theodotion has "have consulted together *to* establish" it.

[293] On one point of some importance Theodotion is wrong and the Septuagint right. According to the former, the king "*set*" Daniel over the whole of his kingdom:<sup>2</sup> but according to the Aramaic—which the

<sup>1</sup> See 291a.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vi. 3 κατέστησεν, but Aram. "*thought* (נשׂא) to set." Theod. dropping γ (which follows a preceding κ) and taking the word as from Heb. נשׂא, "put," may have considered it superfluous, since "set" follows. Dan. vi. 2 "three

Septuagint follows in this respect—the king only “*purposed*” to set Daniel in this position.

This instance is of value in its bearing on the Synoptists. Luke—the latest of the three Evangelists, and a pains-taking historian—may have done his best, as Theodotion did, to return to his original; but he may not always have been successful, and sometimes he may have altered Mark for the worse, while endeavouring to conform to the Hebrew.

presidents of whom Daniel was *one* (רנ) = in A.V. “three . . . *first*,” and LXX perhaps conflates, “(*a*<sub>1</sub>) Daniel was *one* of the three, (*a*<sub>2</sub>) having authority beyond all in the kingdom, . . . honoured before Darius,” *i.e.* “*first*.”

## CHAPTER IV

### CHRONICLES, EZRA, AND ESDRAS

#### § 1. *King Josiah*

[294] THE First Book of Esdras is parallel at first to Chronicles and afterwards to Ezra. After describing Josiah's Passover, Chronicles continues as follows:—

2 Chr. xxxv. 19, 20 "In the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah was this passover kept. After all this, when Josiah had prepared the Temple, Neco king of Egypt went up to fight against Carchemish by Euphrates."

Before "the coming up of Neco" the Septuagint of Chronicles, and 1 Esdras, have the insertions italicized below:—

#### The end of Josiah's reign.

1 Esdr. i. 20–23.

2 Chr. xxxv. 18–20 (LXX).

[295] "(20) In the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah was this Passover celebrated. (21) *And the deeds of Josiah were right before the face of his Lord (lit.) in a heart full of piety. (22) And further what relates to him has been written out in the former times concerning those who have*

(18) "And there was no Passover like this in Israel . . . (19) in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah. (19a) *And the soothsayers, and the sorcerers and the Tharaphein . . . . did king Josiah burn . . .*

sinned and done impiously against the Lord beyond every nation and kingdom, and the things wherein they grieved him are [?]. And the words of the Lord rose up against Israel. (23) And after all these deeds of Josiah it happened<sup>1</sup> that Pharaoh king of Egypt came and stirred up war in Charcamus on the Euphrates."

(19c) *Howbeit the Lord turned not from the anger of his great fury, wherewith the Lord was angry with Judah concerning all the ordinances wherein Manasseh provoked him.* (19d) *And the Lord said, Even Judah will I remove from before my face as I removed Israel, and I have rejected the city that I chose, namely Jerusalem, and the house concerning which I said, My name shall be there.* (20) *And there came up Pharaoh Nechao, king of Egypt, against the king of the Assyrians to the river Euphrates."*

## § 2. *The explanation of the Greek additions*

[296] The explanation of these insertions is as follows. The translator of Esdras is dissatisfied with the termination of the history of Josiah as it stands in Chronicles, because the Chronicler omits the allusion—contained in the parallel Kings—to the pathetic inability of this pious king<sup>2</sup> to cancel God's prediction of retribution for the evil wrought by Manasseh, who is previously declared (in Kings and Chronicles) to have "seduced them to do that which is

<sup>1</sup> "Happened (συνέβη)," (?) Greek corruption for ἀνέβη "came up" (in K. and Chr.). In the preceding verse, "they grieved him are" = ἐλύπησαν αὐτὸν ἔστω. There appears to be some corruption or omission.

<sup>2</sup> 2 K. xxiii. 24-6.



evil *more than did the nations* whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel.”<sup>1</sup>

Esdras therefore inserts a very brief reference to Manasseh. But it is almost lost in the plural (“*those* who have sinned”) and obscured by the substitution of “sin” for “cause to sin,” so that the allusion would hardly have been detected but for the phrase “beyond every nation and kingdom.” The Greek translator of Chronicles—apparently influenced by the same feeling as the author of Esdras—inserted in Chronicles a full translation of the remarks in Kings concerning Josiah.<sup>2</sup> The inference from this is, that when one of two parallel documents makes an insertion to supply a real or supposed defect, the other may supply it also but in a different way. And, if the Greek translation of Chronicles was later than Esdras, or this portion of Esdras, then this is an instance where the later of two documents (LXX Chronicles) supplies a defect better—historically speaking—than the earlier (Esdras) by interpolating a passage out of a third document, the earliest of the three.

### § 3. *The proclamation of Cyrus*

[297] The last words of Chronicles recur as the first words of Ezra. They are also repeated in 1 Esdras. The Hebrew in Chronicles and Ezra is almost exactly the same, but the Septuagint is different. The subject is the proclamation of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple.

The Hebrew is (2 Chr. xxxvi. 23, Ezr. i. 2, 3) “Thus said Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord, the God of heaven, given me: and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem which is in Judah. Who [is there] among you from all his people? The Lord<sup>3</sup> his God [is, *or*, be] with him (so Chr., but Ezr.,

<sup>1</sup> 2 K. xxi. 9, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> 2 K. xxiii. 24–27.

<sup>3</sup> “The Lord” = יהוה, “be” = יהי in Ezra (sometimes יהיה). The two were probably confused.

omitting "the Lord," has "His God be with him") and let him go up." Here Chronicles ends. But Ezra continues, "to Jerusalem which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord, the God of Israel (he is God) which is in Jerusalem" (R.V. marg. "he is the God which is in Jerusalem").

1 Esdr. ii. 3-5.

2 Chr. xxxvi. 23 (LXX). Ezr. i. 2, 3 (LXX).

[298] "(3) These things saith the king of the Persians, Cyrus: Me hath the Lord of Israel the Lord Most High appointed king of the world. (4) And he charged me to build him a house in Jerusalem that is in Judaea. (5) If therefore there is any one of you out of his nation, let his Lord be with him; and going up to Jerusalem that is in Judaea let him build the house of the Lord of Israel—he is the Lord that tabernacled in Jerusalem."

[298] "(23) These things saith Cyrus king of the Persians to<sup>1</sup> all the kingdoms of the earth, There hath given unto me [?] the Lord the God of heaven, and he commanded me to build him a house in Jerusalem in Judaea. Who out of you [is there] out of all his people? There shall be his God with him and let him go up."

[298] "(2) Thus said Cyrus king of the Persians, All the kingdoms hath the God of heaven given unto me and he hath visited me upon me (*sic*),<sup>2</sup> to build him a house in Jerusalem that is in Judah. (3) Who [is there] among you from all his people? Both (?) his God shall be with him and he shall go up to Jerusalem."<sup>3</sup> [Heb. adds, but LXX omits, "which is in Judah . . . . . in Jerusalem."]

[299] It is instructive to note that the Septuagint version of Ezra, which is generally very faithful to the Hebrew—or at least attempts to be—stops almost where the sentence in Chronicles ends: it merely adds "to Jerusalem." This raises

<sup>1</sup> πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις (Α πάσαις τὰς βασιλείας).

<sup>2</sup> ἐπεσκέψατό με ἐπ' ἐμέ. The original is "hath made visitation, *i.e.* injunction, upon me." The translator appears to conflate two constructions.

<sup>3</sup> "Both . . . and" is perhaps meant by καὶ ἔσται—καὶ ἀναβήσεται. Probably the LXX read ἰ before ἦν. It might easily be repeated after the final ἰ in the preceding word (ἦν). Codex A adds ἡ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ· καὶ οἰκοδομησάτω τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσλ· αὐτός ο ὅς ο ἐν Ἰλῆμ.

a doubt whether the translator of Ezra accepted as genuine the Hebrew addition, and whether it may not be of the nature of an Appendix, added under the impression that the extreme abruptness of the termination in Chronicles implied that some words had dropped out.. The translator of Chronicles has fallen into a serious error in making Cyrus address all the kingdoms of the earth.<sup>1</sup> Esdras is accurate though very free. Ezra (LXX) is closest to the original except that the translator (after "kingdoms") casually omits "of the earth" (which Codex A restores). As a fact, the Greek of Ezra is habitually closer to the Hebrew than is the Greek of Esdras—in which the habit of free translation often leads to error (apart from its frequent confusion of some Hebrew words).

#### § 4. *The preface to a letter to the king of Persia*

[300] The next extracts exhibit the above-noted characteristics of Ezra (LXX) and Esdras in a still clearer light. The Hebrew, which passes speedily into Aramaic, is to the following effect: Ezr. iv. 6-11 (R.V.) "And in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign wrote they an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem. And in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions, unto Artaxerxes, king of Persia: and the writing of the letter was written in the Syrian [character] and set forth in the Syrian [tongue<sup>2</sup>]. (8) Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king in this sort: (9) then [wrote] Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions: the Dinaites

<sup>1</sup> It can hardly be a mere case of Greek corruption since it involves the alteration of three terminations, which are corrected by Codex A: but the meaning intended by the translator is doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> "Syrian." R.V. marg. "Or, *Aramaic*," and adds, "Chapter iv. 8-vi. 18 is in Aramaic."



and the Apharsathchites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Shushanchites, the Dehaites, the Elamites, (10) and the rest of the nations whom the great and noble Osnappar brought over, and set in the city of Samaria, and in the rest [of the country] beyond the river, and so forth. (11) This is the copy of the letter that they sent unto Artaxerxes the king (lit. unto him, [even] unto Artaxerxes the king)."

[301] This passage is full of repetitions which indicate original obscurity and subsequent conflation. In particular, the names suggest that Apharsites, if not a corruption of "scribes," is a repetition of Apharsathchites. Also Archevites is said to be an error for "who are Cuthaeans."<sup>1</sup> Esdras omits the list. He also substitutes "Coelesyria" for "beyond the river" (which might mean either east or west of the river), and condenses generally, while Ezra (LXX) clings to the corrupt Hebrew.

I Esdr. ii. 15-16.

Ezr. iv. 6-9 (LXX).

[302] [makes no mention of letters to Ahasuerus.]

"(15) But in the times during the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, there wrote against them<sup>2</sup> (*sic*) against the inhabitants in Judaea and Jerusalem, Belemus<sup>3</sup> and Mithradates and Tabellius and Rathumus and Beeltethumus and Samellius the scribe and the rest that were in office

[302] "(6) And in the reign of Astherus in the beginning of his reign he (*sic*) wrote against<sup>2</sup> them that inhabited Judah and Jerusalem. (7) And in the days of Asardatha he (*sic*) wrote in peace<sup>3</sup> to Mithradates, Tabeel and the rest of the fellow-servants. To the king of the Persians wrote the Phorologos (lit. "carrier of words," but

<sup>1</sup> Black's *Encycl. Bibl.* i. 191, 293.

<sup>2</sup> "Wrote-against them (*κατέγραψεν αὐτοῖς*)," perhaps an error caused by reading *αὐτῷ* "to him" (the reading of A) as *αὐτῷ* (*i.e.* *αὐτοῖς*): "against" in Ezr. = *ἐπὶ*.

<sup>3</sup> "Belemus" (Ezdr.) = "in peace" (Ezr.) = "Bishlam" (R.V.) (see 303).

with these, but dwelling in Samaria and the other places, the hereafter-written letter. (16) To king Artaxerxes the lord thy<sup>1</sup> servants Rathumus the [writer of] the things that befall, and Samelliusthescribe and the rest of their council,

and they that are in Coele-syria and Phoenicia."

also "one levying tribute") a letter in the Syrian language and interpreted. (8) Raoul Badatamen and Samasa the scribe wrote one (*i.e.* a) letter against Jerusalem to Arsartha the king. (9) These things judged Raoum - Baal and Samae the scribe and the rest of our<sup>1</sup> fellow-servants, Deinaeans, Pharesthachaeans, Taraphallaeans, Aphrasaeans, Archouans, Babylonians, Sousunachaeans who are Elamaeans, (10) and the rest of the nations whom Asen-naphar the great and honourable removed from their dwellings and he caused them to dwell in cities of the [land of] Somoron (*sic*) and the rest beyond the river. This is the setting forth of the letter that they sent to him [to Arsartha the king]."<sup>2</sup>

[303] It should be noted here that the translator of Ezra has failed to recognize "Bishlam" as a name. But even in his error he has adhered to the Hebrew, taking "b" as "in," and "shlm" as "peace" (which it actually means). He perhaps connected "in peace" with the phrase of greeting ("Peace be unto you").

<sup>1</sup> "Thy," "our." These readings regard the letter as having commenced, and "thy" and "our" as words in the letter.

<sup>2</sup> The bracketed words are printed by Swete with a capital (Ἰπός) as though they began the letter.



§ 5. *Fasting and praying*

[304] In the following extracts, Esdras mistakes "river" for "young man," omits the statement that God is against them that forsake Him, and converts "so we fasted and besought" into "and we besought again." Ezra (LXX) is so faithful to the Hebrew that the latter need not be printed separately.

1 Esdr. viii. 49-54.

Ezr. viii. 21-24 (LXX and Heb.)

[305] "(49) And I vowed there a fast for the young men before our Lord, (50) to seek from him a prosperous journey both for us and for our children and cattle. (51) For I was abashed [to ask (added by A)] horsemen and foot-soldiers as escort for safety against our enemies. (52) For we [had] said to the king [saying] that the power of our Lord will be with them that seek after him, unto all prospering."<sup>1</sup> (53) And again we besought of our Lord all these things and found him propitious."

[305] "(21) And I proclaimed there a fast at the river Thoue (Hebr. Ahava) to humble ourselves before the face of our God, to seek from him a straight way for ourselves and our children and all our chattels. (22) Because I was ashamed to ask from the king a force and horsemen to deliver us from the enemy in the way. Because we [had] said to the king saying, The hand of our God [is] on all that seek him, for good: *and his might and his anger on all that forsake him.* (23) And we fasted and sought from our God concerning this, and he gave ear unto us (R.V. was entreated by us)."

The italicized words may have been omitted by Esdras as not being to the point, or they may be a late Hebrew interpolation.

<sup>1</sup> "Unto all prospering," *eis pāsan epantōrōsan*.

## CHAPTER V

### JUDGES IN TWO MANUSCRIPTS

#### § 1. *The Song of Deborah, in the Codex Vaticanus (B), and in the Codex Alexandrinus (A)*

[306] LARGE portions of the Book of Judges are translated so differently by the Codex Vaticanus (B) and the Codex Alexandrinus (A) that their texts are practically different versions. The first specimen given below is from the Song of Deborah where the poetic language naturally causes difficulty, as may be seen from the marginal alternatives given by the Revised Version and added in foot-notes below. Codex A, in many books of the Bible, is often more faithful than Codex B is to the Hebrew text. But that is not the case here.

[307] Judg. v. 11-16 (R.V.) <sup>1</sup>“Far from the noise of archers, in the places of drawing water, there shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord, [even] the righteous acts <sup>2</sup>of his rule in Israel. Then the people of the Lord went down to the gates. (12) Awake, awake, Deborah, awake, awake, utter a song: Arise, Barak, and lead thy captivity captive thou son of Abinoam. (13) <sup>3</sup>Then came down a remnant of the nobles <sup>4</sup>[and] the people; the Lord

<sup>1</sup> Or, “Because of the voice of the archers . . . there let them rehearse.”

<sup>2</sup> Or, “toward his villages.”

<sup>3</sup> Or, “Then made he a remnant to have dominion over the nobles [and] the people; the Lord made me have dominion over the mighty.”

<sup>4</sup> Or, as v.r., “the people of the Lord came down for me against (or, among) the mighty.”

came down for me <sup>1</sup>against the mighty. (14) Out of Ephraim [came down] they whose root is in Amalek ; after thee, Benjamin, among thy peoples ; out of Machir came down <sup>2</sup>governors, and out of Zebulon they that handle <sup>3</sup>the marshal's staff. (15) And <sup>4</sup>the princes of Issachar were with Deborah. As was Issachar so was Barak. Into the valley they rushed forth at his feet. By the water-courses of Reuben there were great resolves of heart. (16) Why satest thou among the sheep-folds, to hear the pipings for the flocks? At the water-courses of Reuben there were great searchings of heart."

Judg. v. 11-16 (B) (lit.).

"(11) Relate from the voice of them that play [on the harp] in the midst of them that draw water. There shall they give righteousnesses. Lord, increase righteousnesses in Israel. Then went down to the cities the people of the Lord. (12) Awake, awake, Debhora! Awake, awake, utter a song! Arise, Barak, and take captive thy captivity, son of Abeineem. (13) Then (τότε) went down a remnant to (or, for) the mighty. The people of the Lord went down to (or, for) him in the strong places from me. (14) Ephraim rooted them out in Amalek. After thee, Ben-

Judg. v. 11-16 (A) (lit.).

"(11) . . . to sound-forth the voice of them that play [on the harp] in the midst of them that rejoice. There shall they give righteousnesses to the Lord. Righteousnesses have they strengthened in Israel. Then went down to his cities the people of the Lord. (12) Awake, awake, Debhora! Awake thou myriads with the people. Awake, awake, speak with a song. Strengthening rise-up, Barak, and strengthen thou, Debhora, Barak. Take captive thy captivity, son of Abineem. (13) When, (or, at one time, ποτε) his strength was-great, O Lord, humble for me them that are stronger than I.

<sup>1</sup> Or, "among."

<sup>2</sup> Or, "the staff of the scribe."

<sup>2</sup> Or, "law-givers."

<sup>4</sup> Or, "my princes in Issachar."

jamin, among thy peoples. In me Machir they went down searching out; and from Zabulon drawing with the staff of the setting forth of a scribe. (15) And leaders in Issachar with Debbora and Barak. Thus Barak in the valleys sent on [lit. in] his (*sic*) feet. Into the portions of Reuben great [men] arriving<sup>1</sup> heart. (16) To what [end] sat they in the midst of the digomia<sup>2</sup> to hear the piping of messengers? Into the divisions of Reuben great searchings of heart."

(14) The people of Ephraim avenged itself on them in the valley of thy brother Benjamin among thy peoples. From me Machir they went down searching out; and from Zabulon the Lord was-making-war for me among the mighty thence with the sceptre of-one-that-strengtheneth of leading. (15) In Issachar with Debbora he sent forth his foot-soldiers into the valley. In order that for thee<sup>3</sup> thou shouldst dwell in the midst of borders (lit. lips) he stretched out with his feet divisions of Reuben great ascertainments<sup>4</sup> of heart. (16) Wherefore prithee (lit. for me) sittest thou in the midst of the Mosphaitham? to give ear to the pipings of them that awake [thee] to pass through into the[regions] of Reuben; great trackings-out of heart."

<sup>1</sup> Gk. corruption, *ἐξικνούμενοι* for *ἐξιχνούμενοι*.

<sup>2</sup> *Διγομία*, not recognized in L. & S. Did the writer mean *δινομία*, not in L. & S., but capable of meaning "a double sheep-fold or cattle-stall" (which is the meaning of the Hebrew)?

<sup>3</sup> *ὡς σοι*? Gk. corr. for *ὡς τι* i.e. "wherefore?" as in v. 16.

<sup>4</sup> "Ascertainments" = *ἀκριβασμοί*, "trackings out" = *ἐξιχνιασμοί* (comp. B *ἐξικνούμενοι* for *ἐξιχνούμενοι*), "searchings" (B) = *ἐξετασμοί*.



§ 2. *The difficulty of supposing that the author of A had B before him*

[308] A difficult passage like this does not give the best criteria as to the dates of the several translations. The writer of Codex A, believed to be about a century later than Codex B, might antecedently be supposed to be acquainted with the readings of the earlier MS. From other passages, we might anticipate that here, as well as elsewhere, the writer of A probably had the text of B before him and wrongly thought he was correcting B, even when he was going still further wrong. But there is little if anything to support this view here. Both, in a great measure, go altogether wrong. The principal conclusion from a comparison of the two passages is this, that there are hardly any limits to the extent to which Hebrew poetry may be corrupted in Greek translation—even when the Hebrew is preserved,<sup>1</sup> so that editors and scribes had the opportunity of correcting the faults of the original translation.

[309] There is great difficulty in supposing that the writer of A had B before him in translating the Song of Deborah. Compare the following: (a) (verse 21) "*that ancient river*," (B) "of ancient [times]," (A) "Cadeseim"; (b) (22) "the pransings, the pransings of their strong ones," (B) "with haste there hastened his strong [ones]," (A) "Ammadaroth of his powerful [ones]"; (c) (6) "Shamgar the son of *Anath*," (B) "Anath," (A) "Kenath"; (d) (14) "*Amalek* after thee," (B) "*Amalek* after thee," (A) "*the valley* of thy brother"; (e) (19) "Taanach," (B) "Thanaach,"

<sup>1</sup> In some cases (4b), the LXX may have followed a Hebrew text more correct, or earlier, than our present one: and it may be urged that here the translations of A and B may be based on different Hebrew texts. But in the vast majority of cases elsewhere, and for the most part here also, the differences between the Greek MSS. can be explained by misreadings, or misinterpretations, of the present Hebrew. For example, in the first instance (a) mentioned in paragraph 309, "ancient" and "Cadeseim" differ by little more than the difference between  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$ , letters very easily confused.



(A) Thennach"; (*f*) (23) "Meroz," (B) "Meroz," (A) "Mazor"; (*g*) (24) "Jael," (B) "Jael," (A) "Jel"; (*h*) (24) "Heber," (B) "Chaber," (A) "Chaleb."

We can hardly believe that the writer of A could misrender so many Hebrew names if he had the correct Greek rendering before him. Is it possible that, in this particular passage, the writer of A, being dissatisfied with the version adopted by B and doubtful about his own power to correct it, took another old version and adopted it *en bloc*, without altering a word of it? In that case we have here, in effect, not A, but an old erroneous version adopted by the writer of A, contrary to his usual custom.

### § 3. *The vengeance of Samson*

[310] The following is the reply of Samson, when his Philistine father-in-law offers him his wife's sister as a substitute for his wife :

Judg. xv. 3-7 (R.V.) "(3) And Samson said unto them, This time shall I be blameless in regard of the Philistines, when I do them a mischief.<sup>1</sup> (4) And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between every two tails.<sup>2</sup> (5) And when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks and the standing corn, and also the olive-yards.<sup>3</sup> (6) Then the Philistines said, Who hath done this? And they said, Samson, the son-in-law of the Timnite, because he hath taken<sup>4</sup> his wife

<sup>1</sup> A.V. renders xv. 3, "And Samson said concerning them, Now shall I be more blameless than (A.V. marg. "be blameless from," the R.V. marg. gives "be quits with") the Philistines, though I do them a displeasure."

<sup>2</sup> A.V. "between two tails."

<sup>3</sup> A.V. "both the shocks, and also the standing corn, with the vineyards [and] olives."

<sup>4</sup> A.V. "And they answered, S., the son-in-law of the T., because he had taken . . ."

and given her to his companion. And the Philistines came up, and burnt her and her father with fire. (7) And Sampson said unto them, If ye do after this manner, surely I will be avenged of you,<sup>1</sup> and after that I will cease.

Judg. xv. 3-7 (B) (lit.).

[311] "(3) And Sampson said unto them, I am made-blameless, yea once for all from the Philistines, in that I do with them a mischief. (4) And Sampson went and caught three hundred foxes and took torches and turned tail to tail and placed one torch betwixt the two tails and bound [it]. (5) And he kindled a fire in the torches and sent them forth in the wheat-ears (*στάχυσιν*) of the Philistines, and there were burned [the crops, yea] from the threshing-floor (*ἄλωνος*) even to the wheat-ears up-right, and to the vineyard and olive. (6) And the Philistines said, Who did these things? And they said, Sampson the bridegroom of the Thamnei, because he

Judg. xv. 3-7 (A) (lit.).

[311] "(3) And Sampson said unto him, I am blameless once for all from the Philistines in that I do with you ill [deeds]. (4) And Sampson went and caught three hundred foxes and took torches and bound together tail to tail, and placed one torch betwixt the two tails in the midst. (5) And he lighted a fire in the torches and sent them forth into the sheaves (*δράγματα*)<sup>2</sup> of the Philistines, and he consumed-with-fire the wheat-ears and what-had-been-before-reaped, from the corn - ready - for-treading (*στυβῆς*)<sup>3</sup> even to the standing [corn] and to the vineyard and olive. (6) And the Philistines said, Who did these things? And they said, Sampson the son-

<sup>1</sup> A.V. "Though ye have done this, yet will I be avenged of you."

<sup>2</sup> "sheaves" = *δράγματα*, properly "handfuls [clutched by the reaper]" but also used, in later Greek, of uncut corn.

<sup>3</sup> *Στυβῆς* (= *στοιβῆς*) must mean this, though no instance of it is given in L. & S. The Gk. root means "tread." Codex A conflates, combining a free rendering and a closer one.

took his wife and gave her to him that was of his friends. And the Philistines went up and burned her and her father with fire. (7) And Sampson said to them, If (or, even if) ye do thus [to] this [woman], that verily<sup>1</sup> I will be avenged on you, and at the last I will cease."

in-law of the Thamnathaeon, because he took his wife and gave her to his companion. And the Philistines went in and consumed-with-fire the house of her father and herself and her father with fire. (7) And Sampson said to them, If (or, even if) ye do thus, I will not be satisfied, but my vengeance from one and each<sup>2</sup> of you will I accomplish."

#### § 4. *Codex A less accurate again than B*

[312] Here, again, it is difficult to believe that the writer of A could have had B before him. For why should the former (with B before his face, giving the correct translation) make the mistakes of person in xv. 3, and exhibit a conflate in xv. 5, and insert wrongly (xv. 6) "the house of her father," and make the blunder about "one and each" to which attention is called below?

[313] The very few points in which, simultaneously, B is wrong and A is right, are consistent with B's faithful adherence (in intention at all events) to the Hebrew text: B (xv. 6) has "bridegroom," instead of "son-in-law." The former makes no sense, but it is the usual meaning of the Hebrew word, which means relation by marriage, and here

<sup>1</sup> "If . . . verily," Ἐὰν ποιήσητε οὕτως ταύτην ὅτι ἐλ μὴν . . . "Thus" and "this [woman]" are conflations of "thus (כֹּיֵת)" i.e. "like this (fem.)." "That" = כִּי, and "verily" = אֲמָ : but here the two particles combined = "but" or "nevertheless."

<sup>2</sup> "One and each." Codex A has read "at the last" (אַחֵר) as אֶחָד "one," and dropped the final letter in (ל) אֶחָד "I will cease," so as to make that also mean "one," which it has rendered "(each) one" (unless ἐκάστων is Gk. corr. for ἑσχατον "at the last").

"son-in-law." B (xv. 6) has "of his friends" instead of "companion." But this is because B has taken *m-* as having its prepositional instead of its participial force. Our conclusion is that A has again followed a loose, free, and early translation, while B has adopted a later one, closer to the Hebrew.

§ 5. *Codex A, later on, more accurate than B*

Yet, if we were to suppose that throughout the whole of the book of Judges, or even throughout the story of Samson, B was always more faithful than A to the extant Hebrew, we should be speedily undeceived by the account of Samson's death, where the Hebrew and A agree that the hero "called" to the Lord (but B has "wept"), and that there were "three thousand" spectators (but B has "seven hundred").<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, it appears safe to adopt the rule—subject to exceptions arising from special circumstances—that a later translation is likely to be more accurate than an earlier one.

<sup>1</sup> [313a] Judg. xvi. 27, 28. "Weep," *κλαλεῖν* = *בכה* about a hundred times. No other Hebrew word represents *κλαλεῖν* in historical narrative, with *three exceptions, all in Judges* (ix. 7, xv. 18, xvi. 28), where the Hebrew is *קרא*, "call"—a fact that points to a hypothesis that Judges may have been translated by a special (and inaccurate) translator. In Judg. ix. 7, where Jotham "cries" to the men of Shechem and utters the Parable of the Trees, even A has "weep." But in the Samson story (xv. 18, xvi. 28) A has "shout," *βοᾶν*.

Mr. W. S. Aldis suggests that *ἐκλαυσε* may be a Greek corruption for *ἐκάλεισε*. It would be more natural that the comparatively rare *κλαλεῖν* should be corrupted into the comparatively common *καλεῖν*, comp. 2 K. viii. 12 "weepeth" *καλεῖ* (A *καλεῖ*): but the suggestion affords a very reasonable explanation of the error.



## CHAPTER VI

### PROOF OF MARK'S PRIORITY TO MATTHEW AND LUKE

#### § 1. *Unsafety of argument from mere antecedent probability*

[314] ONE important, though inconvenient, conclusion from the facts alleged in the preceding chapters is this, that it is unsafe to infer that the general characteristics of two parallel narratives will be found in any special passage. As a rule, Theodotion is closer to the Hebrew than the Septuagint is; Ezra (LXX) is closer than Esdras, Codex A than Codex B: but it is not always so. It is safer to draw conclusions from Hebraic idiom, which generally represents an attempt to return to a Hebrew text; but the attempt, as we have seen, is not always successful: sometimes an early, free, paraphrastic translation is closer to the substance of the original Hebrew than a later and more literal rendering. Again, we have found indications that Codex A, though in most books more faithful to the Hebrew than Codex B, is less faithful in parts of Judges, and that parts of Judges, in B, may have been rendered into Greek by a special translator, who differed in his views of Hebrew from the translators of the rest of the Bible. Later on (538) we shall find grounds for believing that the Septuagint has been either revised, or translated by other hands, from that point in the Pentateuch where the Law is introduced. All these facts greatly complicate the problem of returning from a Greek translation to the Hebrew original, except in those cases where the sense, or the comparison of two or



more parallel versions, points to a distinct error, made antecedently probable by such evidence as was set forth in *Clue*.

§ 2. *Analogy between the versions and editions of parts of the Old Testament and parts of the New*

[315] The general facts about versions and editions of the Greek Old Testament resemble what Luke says concerning the "many" who took in hand to draw up a narrative about the historical facts that constitute the basis of the New Testament. The early Greek translation of the Old Testament appears to have been free and full of errors. Yet it was venerated by Philo, and probably by other Jews who were, like Philo, ignorant of Hebrew: and we hear little or nothing of complaints about inaccuracy or attempts to remedy it, till the second century of the Christian era. By that time controversies had sprung up between Christians and Jews. The former would naturally appeal to the Greek Old Testament, and we know that Justin, while making this appeal, accused the Jews of corrupting the Hebrew when it differed from his own erroneous Greek. Then arose the improved versions of (i) Aquila, (ii) Theodotion, (iii) Symmachus. Subsequently came the great work of Origen, combining their three versions with that of the (iv) Septuagint, and placing them parallel to the Hebrew, written in (v) Hebrew, and in (vi) Greek characters.<sup>1</sup>

[316] Here then we have just what Luke described—"many" people trying to translate the ancient fundamental scriptures, and with very different success. And these facts go far to explain the variations in Codices such as A and B, above described. Some may have preferred the bald but close translation of Aquila, others the better Greek of Symmachus. And the preference may not have been

<sup>1</sup> From its containing these six parts, Origen's work was called the Hexapla, or Six-fold. Other anonymous translations were appended to some editions of the Hexapla (see Smith's *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* "Hexapla").

consistently extended to the whole of the Bible. For example, the Vulgate is based upon Theodotion, so far as Daniel is concerned, but on the Septuagint elsewhere. Similarly, the scribe, or editor, who was responsible for the text of Codex A may have preferred some translation, differing from the Septuagint, as a guide for one book, or passage in a book, but not for others. Consequently, it is unsafe to assume that the writers of A and B were using their own judgment, when they differ from one another, or from the Hebrew, or from both. They may have been following one of the "many" translators, their predecessors, without using their own judgment, except as to the choice of a guide.

[317] The same conclusions must apply to the writers of the Synoptic Gospels. When we say that Mark, Matthew, or Luke, rendered or misrendered the original Hebrew in this or that way, we do not mean that the writers of the words under discussion quoted from our Synoptic Gospels, severally resorted to the Hebrew and used their private judgment, or even that they knew anything about Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> They may have followed some of the "many" translations already

<sup>1</sup> [317a] As regards the authorship of the Gospels, see note (ii) in the "References" above, which warns the reader that the use of the name "Matthew" in these pages does not imply "that the actual writer was Matthew." A friend asks: "If Matthew was the alleged, not the real, author, how can you explain the fact that he, a comparatively unimportant Apostle, received this distinction, instead of Peter, or John, or James the brother of John?" The answer is, that Peter and John are expressly declared in the Acts of the Apostles to have been (Acts iv. 13) "*unlettered* and ignorant men." In that passage, ἀγράμματοι ("unlettered") is interpreted, by some, as meaning "ignorant of Jewish traditions"; but the more natural meaning is (as in Epict. ii. 14, Plat. *Tim.* 23 B) "*unable to read or write*"—especially as mere ignorance of tradition would appear to be expressed sufficiently by the word "ignorant." If Peter and John were "unlettered," their brothers Andrew and James would probably be in the same condition. Thus, the leading Apostles might naturally be thought incapable of writing Gospels. Now the only one of the Twelve who must necessarily have been able to write was Matthew. Being a Publican, he was bound to be a ready writer. It was therefore extremely natural that the first written Gospel should be ascribed to him.

in existence, and sometimes one, sometimes another—with variations naturally far greater than in the Old Testament, because there was still at work among preachers and writers of the Gospel the influence of current oral tradition.

### § 3. *The Triple Tradition and the Double Tradition in the Synoptic Gospels*

The facts and considerations above mentioned may seem to make it almost, if not quite, impossible to decide between the claims of the Synoptists to documentary priority. Luke, for example, is the third of the Synoptists chronologically: "But," it may be asked, "may he not have followed—in some passage where he partly disagrees and partly agrees with Mark—a document earlier than Mark, from which Mark and Luke both borrowed, and Luke the more accurately of the two?"

[318 (i)] The answer is this: "There probably *was* such a document, a Hebrew one, earlier than Mark, and Luke probably borrowed from it sometimes more accurately than Mark. But there is evidence to shew that *our present Mark contains that document*, only in a Greek form, and with a good many errors, conflations, and additions."

If it be asked what kind of testimony can prove this, we reply that, besides evidence of translation from Hebrew, there is other evidence of quite a different kind derived from the text of Matthew. A close study of what may be called the Triple Tradition—that is to say, the account of Christ's acts and shorter sayings attested by the triple testimony of Mark, Matthew, and Luke—shews that *Matthew and Luke, in these portions of their Gospels, contain nothing of importance in common that is not also found in our present text of Mark*.

[318 (ii)] The reader must carefully distinguish the Triple Tradition from those portions of the Synoptic Gospels where Mark is wanting, and where the attestation depends



on two Evangelists, or on one alone. A comparison of the Synoptists will show that *Matthew and Luke, where Mark is altogether wanting, often agree very closely indeed*, as, for example, in this passage of the Sermon on the Mount: "No one (Lk. servant) can be bond-servant to two lords; for either he will hate the one and love the other or hold fast to one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."<sup>1</sup> In the whole of the Triple Tradition there is perhaps *no instance of such close agreement as in this and in other passages common to Matthew and Luke and wanting in Mark*. But these passages are best considered by themselves. Almost all of them contain sayings, not doings, of Christ, and they have (many of them) peculiarities of style and subject-matter which render it desirable to consider them separately, as constituting a distinct document from the Triple Tradition. Theoretically, it may be urged that this has no more right to be treated as a distinct document than any other doubly-attested tradition, *e.g.* the similarities common to Mark and Matthew alone, or to Mark and Luke alone. But in practice this collection of Matthew-Luke passages is so much more important than any other "double traditions" in the Synoptists that we shall find it convenient, for brevity, to call it *the Double Tradition*, and to discuss it in a separate volume, without, of course, allowing this convenient title to commit us to any conclusions about the authorship of this or that passage in the collection.

<sup>1</sup> Mt. vi. 24, Lk. xvi. 13. The Triple Tradition, in English, is distinguished by black letters in *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels* (Abbott and Rushbrooke, Macmillan, 1884). Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* (Macmillan, 1880) gives the Triple Tradition in Greek, distinguishing the portions attested by three and by two Evangelists, severally; and it also prints separately the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke, and the single Traditions of Matthew and of Luke. For the critical study of the Greek Synoptic Gospels the latter work is indispensable.



#### § 4. *Conclusion from the phenomena of the Triple Tradition*

[319] In order to explain the agreements between the Synoptists in the Triple Tradition, what hypotheses are open (if we dismiss that of accidental coincidence as absurd)?

(i) Did Mark borrow from Matthew and Luke?

If he did, he must have adapted his narrative so as to *interweave in it* (with the comparatively few and unimportant exceptions that will be mentioned) *every phrase and word common to Matthew and Luke*—a hard task even for a literary forger of consummate skill, and an impossible one for such a writer as Mark (to say nothing of the absurdity that one of the earliest Evangelists should have constructed a gospel on such complex lines).

(ii) Did (a) Mark borrow from a larger written Gospel than his own, or from a larger Oral Tradition, and did (b) Matthew and Luke borrow from either or both of these sources, and not from our Mark?

If (b) had been the case, we should have found Matthew and Luke occasionally agreeing in borrowing, from that larger written Gospel or Oral Tradition, something that is not in our Mark. But they practically never do this. In the Triple Tradition they limit their agreements (with the unimportant exceptions that will be mentioned) to passages that are also in our Mark. It is impossible that this limitation should be merely accidental.

Whether Mark borrowed from (a) "a larger document or larger Oral Tradition," we do not know. But, if he did, we conclude that at all events (b) Matthew and Luke did *not* borrow from it in the Triple Tradition.

(iii) Did Matthew borrow from Luke or Luke from Matthew? If they did, Matthew and Luke would occasionally contain important similarities not found in Mark. But this, in the Triple Tradition, is practically never the case.

(iv) Did Matthew and Luke borrow from a Gospel alto-

gether different from Mark? They did so in the Double Tradition. But in the Triple Tradition they cannot have done so for the reason mentioned in (iii): they would then contain *important* similarities not found in Mark. But they do not. Both Matthew and Luke often differ from Mark in details of great importance; but, where that is the case, *they rarely or never agree together against Mark*. Their agreements against Mark, so far as the Triple Tradition is concerned, are almost always unimportant.

[320] (v) Did Matthew and Luke borrow from *our Mark*? This hypothesis will satisfy almost all the facts, on the assumption that the first two used a great deal of freedom in omitting many details in Mark. But that assumption will not be necessary if we modify the hypothesis thus:—

[321] (vi) Matthew and Luke, in the Triple Tradition, borrowed independently from *a tradition contained in Mark*.

This leaves us free to believe that Mark, as was natural in a very early Gospel, may have contained conflations, mistranslations, paraphrases, and paraphrastic additions. Some of these Matthew and Luke might reject as non-authoritative. Others they do not insert—but can hardly be said to reject if they were not in their edition of Mark.

The conclusion will then be, that Matthew and Luke had before them either our Mark,<sup>1</sup> or some shorter form of it, as the basis of their account of Christ's acts and shorter sayings. The two may have used different editions of Mark. But if they did, those editions did not agree in including anything of importance that is not found in our Mark.

### § 5. *Illustration of the relation between the Synoptists*

[322] It is so important to realize the scientific certainty of conclusions deducible from *three* closely agreeing parallel

<sup>1</sup> With corrections (323).

documents that a homely illustration must not be despised. If an examiner is looking over school translation-papers and finds three of them agreeing for several words together, he is bound to suspect copying. Even though the boys have heard their master translating the passage for them, the examiner knows very well that no boys would retain many consecutive words of the master's version so as to reproduce them with exact agreement: so he will put aside the three papers, which we will call those of Primus, Secundus, and Tertius, for further examination.

The fact that Primus, Secundus, and Tertius, are sometimes all in agreement proves, of course, nothing as to priority. But, on closely analysing the papers, he finds, we will suppose, that—although Primus often agrees with Secundus where Tertius differs, and Tertius often agrees with Secundus where Primus differs—Primus and Tertius hardly ever agree except in those parts where they both agree with Secundus. He will then infer that Primus, Secundus, and Tertius, were sitting together in the examination, and that Secundus was the boy in the middle from whom the two outside boys copied. Primus and Tertius could not copy from one another because Secundus intervened; and whenever Primus and Tertius agreed, it was because they copied from the boy in the middle.

But let us further suppose that Primus and Tertius, when taxed with their offence, endeavour to throw blame on Secundus as well, by saying that they had all three brought printed translations into the class-room and were copying from these. The answer would be immediate: "If you, Primus and Tertius, were copying from a book, and not from Secundus, how did it happen that you never copied from that book anything but what Secundus, as you say, copied?"

This concrete instance illustrates a general rule: *Whenever two documents agree with one another in passages common*



*to a third document and in no others, the presumption is that the two have borrowed from the third.*<sup>1</sup>

§ 6. *The corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke*

[323] Roughly speaking, the case put in the last section applies to the three Synoptists. Matthew and Luke may be described as "the outside boys," Mark as "the boy in the middle"; and Matthew and Luke copied independently from Mark.

But this, though of very great value as a brief and clear approximation to a very important truth, nevertheless does not represent the exact truth, which will now be more completely stated.

Our present Mark, being the earliest extant attempt to represent the Acts of the Lord in Greek, contains, as might be expected, many roughnesses, obscurities, and vernacular expressions—some of them specially condemned by Greek grammarians—likely to be removed by the earliest Evangelists using this Gospel. We know from the preface to Luke's Gospel that many Christian narratives, prior to Luke's, have perished. It is therefore not in the least surprising that there should have been many other editions of Mark besides ours, and that traces of one of these should be found in Matthew and Luke.

To complete, therefore, the analogy sketched in the last section, we must suppose that "the outside boys" copied from a *corrected copy* of the translation of "the middle boy." It would follow that, whenever "the outside boys" agreed against "the middle boy," it was because his translation con-

<sup>1</sup> It is of course easy to find superficial exceptions to this rule. When two novelists "agree in passages common to Pope," it by no means follows that they have "borrowed from Pope." One may have borrowed from some author who has quoted Pope; another from a Dictionary of Familiar Quotations. Many other such exceptions might be imagined. But they would not interfere with the soundness of the rule, taken as a "general" one and applied to the Synoptic Gospels.



tained something faulty in style, or obscure, or positively erroneous, or at all events something that a Corrector might naturally deem faulty in one of these three points.

### § 7. *Appeal to facts*

Now, if this last statement holds good for the Synoptists, that is to say if Matthew and Luke, when covering the ground occupied by Mark, never agree against Mark except where Mark requires—or may have seemed to early editors to require—some amendment of style or accuracy, the fact is not only of great importance in its bearing on the hypothesis of a Hebrew basis for the Synoptic Gospels, but also one capable, in part, of verification without much difficulty.

[324] It is mostly very easy to distinguish amendments of style from amendments of fact. The former would include corrections of the impersonal subject "they" (meaning "one," or "people"), substitutions of the grammatically expressed interrogative for the interrogative that is expressed merely by tone, changes of the historic present into the past tense, insertion of pronouns or substitution of nouns for pronouns, the correction of a vernacular word into a polite one meaning the same thing (534-41), and other slight changes requiring little discussion.

[325] But when Mark speaks—as we have found (192-5)—about "wild beasts, while Matthew and Luke speak about "fasting," or when Mark has (196) "by four," but Matthew and Luke "on a bed," then the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, which we may call corrections of Mark, assume a different character. And if a few of these corrections are shewn to be in all probability due to a Hebrew original, which Mark appeared to the Corrector to have mistranslated, then we are led to infer that other corrections of this class—that is to say, not obviously ex-

plicable as improvements of style—probably proceeded from the same cause.

If once this inference is established, it will lead us to recognize the existence of Mark-corrections that may without exaggeration be described as amounting to an edition, or editions, of Mark, later than our Mark (at all events in parts <sup>1</sup>) but earlier than Matthew and Luke, edited at a time when the Hebrew original of the Gospel still exercised influence.

[326] In order to perceive the importance of this conclusion, let us refer to a corresponding fact in the Old Testament. There we find that in several passages the text of the oldest manuscript of the Septuagint, the Codex Vaticanus, appears to have been corrected by the later Codex Alexandrinus, so as to conform the meaning to the Hebrew. In such passages the Vaticanus represents the *earliest Greek*, but the Alexandrinus mostly represents *the historical fact, that is to say the Hebrew, misrepresented by the earliest Greek*.<sup>2</sup> So it may be sometimes here. Mark may be the earliest, but not always the most accurate of the Evangelists. He may have mistranslated the Hebrew of the Logia as the Codex Vaticanus has mistranslated the Old Testament, and the error may be rectified in the corrections adopted by the later Evangelists.

<sup>1</sup> [325a] "In parts." It is of course possible that some of the lengthy details in our Mark, *e.g.* about Herod, about the lunatic, etc., may have been added to Mark subsequently to the publication of the edition of Mark used by Matthew and Luke. In other words, our Mark may combine *late interpolations*—not known to Matthew (and perhaps not to Luke)—with a *text earlier* than that which was used by Matthew and Luke. This would be in analogy with the LXX which is an earlier text than that of Aquila and Theodotion but shews occasional signs of Christian interpolation.

It does not follow that Matthew and Luke used the *same* edition of Mark. Suppose Matthew to have used the sixteenth, and Luke the seventeenth, edition. We should then find in Matthew and Luke all the corrections common to these two editions.

<sup>2</sup> "Mostly." There may be exceptional cases where B has translated a Hebrew version older than our present Hebrew text. And we have seen that, in Judges (309), B is often closer to the Hebrew than A is. But the general rule is as stated above.

§ 8. *The use of a complete table of the corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke*

[327] The analogy between the codices of the Old Testament, and the three Synoptic accounts of Christ's life in the New Testament, is of course only partial. Though the Synoptic Gospels may be shewn to be based on a Hebrew Gospel, yet the Hebrew text did not remain, like that of the Old Testament, influencing editors of Greek translations for many centuries after the first Greek translation appeared. And, on the other side, it is reasonable to suppose that floating oral tradition would combine with the "many" treatises about Christ's life that existed before Luke's Gospel to modify the earliest traditions in ways to which no parallel can be found in the Septuagint. Nevertheless it must be of use to all students of the Synoptic Gospels to have before them a table of the corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke.

[328] But if there is to be such a table, it ought to be complete, in spite of the risk of conveying an impression of tedious, unnecessary, and pedantical minuteness. A few telling instances of these "corrections" might possibly prove that the Corrector or Editor<sup>1</sup> had access to Mark's Hebrew original; but only a large collection will enable readers to look as it were over his shoulder and to enter into his mind, so that we may put ourselves in his position and realize his

<sup>1</sup> "The Corrector" will sometimes be used to denote the origin of any reading in which Matthew and Luke agree (in the Triple Tradition) against Mark. But the term is not to commit us to any definite view as to *one* Corrector or Editor. There may have been a score of editions of Mark, all trying to make the Gospel less obscure and ungrammatical, and some of them trying to make it more edifying. About such details we can know nothing: and it is most important to keep ourselves from all but the simplest and most verifiable hypotheses about original documents and editions. Complex hypotheses on such subjects, besides wasting time, prejudice the mind against dispassionate investigation of minute verbal differences—a task laborious but absolutely necessary if we are to reach a scientific conclusion.



motives in making the corrections, and, to some extent, Matthew's and Luke's motives in adopting them. An Appendix to this work presents, in parallel columns, all the Greek passages in Mark that have been thus corrected, and the corresponding Greek corrections in Matthew and Luke.

[329] The Appendix appeals to none but students familiar with Greek. But an attempt has been made in the following pages to explain as many of the Corrections as do not refer to style and to Greek construction, in such a way as to be intelligible to readers knowing nothing but English. The explanations, however, must of necessity be somewhat more difficult to follow than those contained in the First Part of this series. There, the object being to prove translation from Hebrew, it was permissible to select, and collect in any order, instances that could be made briefly intelligible. In *Clue* it was pointed out (1) that a very few cases of manifest error in one of two parallel documents—such as “am” parallel to “follow,” “found for himself” parallel to “happened,” “carried” parallel to “was in good health”—would suffice to prove translation from French, and the same was shewn to apply to Hebrew. The course adopted therefore was to select such errors as might be expected to arise from confusion of Hebrew letters *e.g.* ד and ר, and we began with “Edom (אֶדֹם)” and “Aram (אֲרָם)” in accordance with that plan. But now a different method must be adopted.

[330] Following Mark's order, we must take each one of the corrections above described (except those which fall under the general heading of corrections for Greek style or clearness). If we can explain each from Hebrew translation we shall be glad to do so: but if we are forced to explain some (as we are forced to explain many of the deviations of Chronicles from Kings) as dictated by *motive* of a non-grammatical kind—*e.g.* the desire to remove a stumbling-block, or to improve what is edifying but might be more edifying,



or to exaggerate what is wonderful but might be more wonderful—then we must adopt, however unwillingly, the latter explanation. Nor must conjectures be despised, provided that they are based on allegations of fact that may help others to advance to something better than conjecture. If we cannot in any way explain an instance, we must say so: for a negative, as well as a conjecture, may be “more pregnant of direction than an indefinite.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bacon's *Essays*, 25.



BOOK II  
THE PRINCIPAL CORRECTIONS  
OF MARK





## BOOK II

### THE PRINCIPAL CORRECTIONS OF MARK

#### § 1. *Arrangement*

[331] MARK'S order is followed. Opposite to each *corrigendum* of Mark is placed the *correction* adopted by Matthew and Luke. If an instance is not found here, it must be assumed to be one of the comparatively unimportant class referring to Greek style or grammatical improvement, and must be looked for in the Greek Appendix.

[332] *Corrections* must not be confused with additions, that is to say, with the passages that Matthew and Luke agree in *adding* to Mark. To transcribe these would be to transcribe the greater part of the Sermon on the Mount and other long discourses of our Lord that find a place in (318 (ii)) the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke. All this Mark omits, confining himself to Christ's acts and shorter sayings—commonly called the Triple Tradition, as being the subject-matter of the three Synoptists—with which alone we have to do in the present treatise.

[333] Occasionally there may be doubt whether an expression should be treated as a *correction* of the Triple Tradition, or an *addition* belonging to the Double Tradition. For example, after the words "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit," Matthew and Luke add "and with fire." Now it might appear probable, upon investigation (340*a*), that Mark has paraphrased a Hebrew original that might seem to the Corrector to imply "fire"; and in that case "the

Spirit and fire" would be a correction of Mark's "Spirit." On the other hand, Matthew and Luke continue as follows—agreeing almost verbatim—in a passage omitted by Mark: ". . . with fire. *Whose fan is in his hand . . . thoroughly purge his threshing-floor . . ., but the chaff he shall burn with fire unquenchable.*" The words "Whose . . . unquenchable," in accordance with what was stated above (318 (ii)), must be discussed as belonging, not to the Triple, but to the Double Tradition. And it may be contended with some shew of reason that the words "with fire" are not exactly a correction of the Triple Tradition, but part of a preface to a passage in the Double. In this and other doubtful cases, the instance will generally be found included in the following list.

§ 2. (*Mk.*) "*the country of Judaea*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*the country round about Jordan*"

*Mk.* i. 5 (lit.).<sup>1</sup>

*Mt.* iii. 5 (lit.).

*Lk.* iii. 3.

[334] "And there was going out unto him all the Judæan country and the Jerusalemites all [of them]. . . ."

"Then there was going out unto him Jerusalem and all the [land of] Judæa and all the *surrounding-country of Jordan.*"

"And he came to all the *surrounding-country of Jordan.* . . ."

"The Judæan country" was intended to have the same meaning as a similar phrase in John where it is said that Jesus, after the interview with Nicodemus in Jerusalem, "came into the Judæan *land*," i.e. out of the capital into the *surrounding-country*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [334*a*] In this and many other instances where the object is to indicate the verbal agreement or disagreement between parallel passages, English idiom has been entirely sacrificed to this object. The rendering, above and elsewhere, is intended, not as a translation, but as a representation of certain points of the Greek, in English words, adapted for those who do not know Greek.

<sup>2</sup> [334*b*] Jn. iii. 22 R.V. "into the land (γῆν) of Judæa" might mislead some to suppose that "the land of" was simply an orientalism, as in Mt. ii. 20, etc.

[335] The Corrector felt<sup>1</sup> that as "the surrounding-country" was meant, that word should be substituted; and Matthew and Luke followed him. But unfortunately this Greek term is repeatedly applied in the beginning of the Pentateuch to the "surrounding-country," "Circle," or "Plain," *of the Jordan*, sometimes with, but sometimes without, mention of "the Jordan."<sup>2</sup> It is therefore an ambiguous term: Matthew and Luke, in adopting it, have applied it to *the Jordan instead of to Jerusalem*, and both of them have added "of Jordan" for clearness.<sup>3</sup> But Matthew has conflated this with "the Judaea(n)," which he takes as the noun

"the land of Israel"; and it is very doubtful whether many English readers would understand the R.V. here (Mk. i. 5) "the country (χώρα) of Judaea" to mean (as it does) "*the country*" as distinct from "*the city*."

It is noteworthy that the adjective "Judaean" applied to "land" or "country" occurs only in these two passages of Mk. and Jn., and that Mk. and Jn. (vii. 25) alone use the word translated, above, "Jerusalemite." The use of the fem. adj. "Judaean," *without a noun*, to mean "Judaea," is so common that the noun, "country," could not be inserted without a special meaning, as here.

Χώρα is used for "the country round Jerusalem," or "the country of the Jews," as distinct from *Jerusalem itself*, in Jn. xi. 55, Acts x. 39, and also in a LXX insertion in 1 Esdr. v. 45. In Ezr. ii. 1, "the children of *the province* (הנהגות)," LXX has οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς χώρας parallel to 1 Esdr. v. 7 οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

<sup>1</sup> "Felt," i.e. *probably* felt. Where the omission of the word cannot mislead the reader—as, for example, in describing the *motives* of the hypothetical Corrector (or, Correctors), and the *reasons* for the adoptions of his (or their) corrections by Matthew and Luke—"probably" may sometimes be omitted, for brevity.

<sup>2</sup> [335a] Gen. xiii. 10, 11, R.V., "the *Plain* (רֶבֶד) (marg. *Circle*) of Jordan," τὴν περὶχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδ.; in Gen. xiii. 12, "*cities of the Plain*," the word is used absolutely to mean "the Circle [of the Jordan]," and so, too, in Gen. xix. 17, 28. In Gen. xix. 25, 29, it is called ἡ περὶοικος.) In Deut. xxxiv. 3, "the Plain," i.e. Circle, is called "the Plain of the valley of Jericho," LXX (om. "valley") καὶ τὰ περὶχωρα Ἰεριχώ. On one occasion, the Jordanic term (בְּכֶר) is applied to Jerusalem, Neh. xii. 28 (R.V.) "the plain (marg. Circuit) round about Jerusalem," τῆς περὶχωρου κυκλῶθεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

The same Greek word, περὶχωρος, is used in Neh. iii. 9, 12 (R.V.) "half *the district* of Jerusalem" (but others render "environs"); the Hebrew for this is חֶבֶל (comp. Neh. iii. 14, 16, etc.). Comp. pseudo-Peter § 9 ἦλθεν ὄχλος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς περὶχωρον.

<sup>3</sup> The words "of Jordan" may have been added by Mt. and Lk. independently, as being implied in the term "surrounding country"; or they may have been added before, in the editions of Mk. severally used by them.

"Judaea." Luke accepts "the surrounding-country of Jordan" as a substitute for Mark's "Judæan country . . . Jerusalemites." But he perceived that, if the Baptist baptized in Jordan, it was a very small matter to say that the people near Jordan came to him. Now there is very little difference in Hebrew between saying that a man comes to a city and the city comes to a man: so, taking the latter view, Luke says that the Baptist "came to all the surrounding-country of the Jordan."<sup>1</sup>

§ 3. (*Mk.*) "*With the Holy Spirit,*" (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*in (or, with) the Holy Spirit and with fire*"

The Synoptists give the last words of John the Baptist as follows:—

Mk. i. 8.

" . . . but he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit."

Mt. iii. 11, 12.

" . . . he shall baptize you in (or, with) the Holy Spirit *and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand . . . with fire unquenchable.*"

Lk. iii. 16, 17.

" . . . he shall baptize you in (or, with) the Holy Spirit *and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand . . . with fire unquenchable.*"

[336] These passages suggest questions of the greatest importance: (a) Did Mark omit the words "with fire" because he considered them almost unintelligible without giving a fuller account of the Baptist's preaching than suited a Gospel that confined itself mainly to the acts and shorter sayings of the Lord? (b) Did some later edition of Mark,

<sup>1</sup> [335b] The preposition "to" is frequently omitted in Hebrew before names of places after verbs of motion. And subject and object are frequently reversible, e.g. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 10 "The workmen gave it" (marg. "they gave it to the workmen"); Dan. xi. 2 "He shall stir up all" (marg. "all this shall stir up"); Dan. xi. 5 "The king shall be strong," LXX "he shall be strong, i.e. have power, over the kingdom," Amos ix. 12 "may possess the remnant," LXX "the remnant may seek."



copied by Matthew and Luke independently, insert the words "with fire" because they seemed to be predicted by passages in the prophets and to harmonize with the account, given in the Acts, of the descent of the Spirit "as tongues of fire"? (c) Did some controversial motive, *e.g.* the desire to discourage novel and heretical forms of baptism,<sup>1</sup> induce Mark to omit the words? If question (c) were answered affirmatively, the authority of Mark would be shaken, because he would be shewn to have altered the original, not through an error of misunderstanding, but to remove a "scandal"; and, though in a less degree, the same consequence would follow from an affirmative to (a). An affirmative to (b) would impair the authority of Matthew and Luke.

[337] But if it can be shewn that the words "with fire" may have been added by a verbal corruption, then, although the authority of Matthew and Luke, as against Mark, will be somewhat impugned, the consequences will be less serious. A scribal error in a chronicler can very often be detected by scientific classification and comparison of texts. It is far more difficult to detect a writer who alters the text because he aims at seemliness, edification, clearness, etc. Does the context, then, indicate any possibilities of corruption?

[338] In attempting to answer this question, we naturally compare Luke's words here with an apparent reproduction of them in Acts i. 5, "John indeed baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized in (or, with) the Holy Spirit." There, the words are represented as being uttered by Jesus, and they are repeated by Peter verbatim in Acts xi. 16 as uttered by the Lord. Here, then, we have *Luke as a historian, and Luke as a recorder of the words of Peter, twice omitting "with fire,"* when the saying of the Baptist is apparently quoted by Jesus. Now we can hardly suppose that Luke desires to suggest that the Baptist made a prediction about Jesus which Jesus Himself discarded. It

<sup>1</sup> Iren. i. 21.

seems more probable—and the probability is confirmed by John<sup>1</sup>—that Luke inserted these words here owing to *some corruption special to this passage*, and that in other passages quoting the Baptist's words, the *corruption being absent*, the insertion was absent too.

[339] The peculiarity that distinguishes the context of Matthew and Luke from that of Mark (and from the two quotations in the Acts) is that the first two append a tradition that begins with the word "whose." But the first two letters of the Hebrew "whose" mean "fire": and the two words are actually confused not only by the Septuagint but by other "ancient authorities"—so says the margin of our Revised Version—in Numb. xxi. 30 "*which* [reacheth] unto Medeba," where the Septuagint has "*fire* unto Moab."<sup>2</sup>

[340] Now the casual repetition of a syllable, or casual omission of one of two consecutive identical syllables, is a frequent cause of documentary corruption. This Synoptic difference, then, might result from a merely scribal error. On the one hand, Mark—who excludes the longer sayings of Jesus and might *a fortiori* exclude the longer sayings of John the Baptist—might (if he had this utterance of the Baptist before him) stop short too soon by two or three letters and so omit "fire." On the other, Matthew and Luke might follow a tradition that reduplicated the first syllable of "whose" so as to produce the word "fire" before it.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jn. i. 33 "The same is he that baptizeth in (or, with) the Holy Spirit."

<sup>2</sup> "Which," or "whose" =  $\text{מִי}$ : "fire" =  $\text{אֵשׁ}$ . See Dr. Ginsburg's Introduction, pp. 326–7, as to the curious comments on this passage. Perhaps the LXX is right.

<sup>3</sup> [340a] It is probable (160) that the original Hebrew Gospel of Mark, though not quoting the prophets, was based upon prophecy, and contained allusions—some of which are obscured or lost in the Greek—to prophetic expressions. The mention of the "(winnowing)-fan" here (Mt. iii. 12, Lk. iii. 17) suggests that the Baptist may have borrowed the word from the only passage (Is. xxx. 24) where it ( $\text{מִנְיָן}$ ) is found in the Old Testament, where Isaiah goes on to describe the purification of the nations by God, whose "tongue is as a devouring fire and his breath" [or, "spirit," for the Hebrew ( $\text{רוּחַ}$ ) is the same] "is as an overflowing stream." If the original Hebrew Gospel had, "He shall baptize you, or, purify

To discuss which of these two possibilities is the more probable would be out of place here. But two points may be noticed :

[341] The Double Tradition represents the Baptist as subsequently sending two of his disciples to Jesus to say, "Art thou he that is to come?" And in His answer Jesus apparently implies that John was *not* "in the kingdom of God," in other words, that John desired a recourse to arms, the kingdom of "this world." If this was so, the Baptist may have contemplated in his prediction something entirely different from the event that fulfilled it. The "Spirit" of which John spoke is assumed without discussion by most modern Christians to be the gentle dove-like Spirit of Christ, and the "fire" to be an influence of beneficent purification. But both the language of Isaiah above-mentioned, and the words of the Double Tradition here, would rather suggest an influence that, although ultimately purifying, is of an immediately destructive and retributive character, such as Origen speaks of when commenting upon the "axe" and the "fire" here mentioned: "Whoever has allowed wickedness to establish itself so deeply in his soul as to be a ground full of thorns, he must be cut down by the quick and powerful word of God. . . . To such a soul *that fire must be sent which finds out thorns and by its divine virtue stands where they are and does not also burn up the threshing-floor or the standing corn,*" and he goes on to speak of "afflictions and evil spirits and dangerous diseases and grievous sicknesses," as being made instruments by which God chastens men for their good.

It is at least certain that the words of the Baptist are capable of meaning, "I indeed baptize you with the milder you, with the winnowing-fan," it is quite in accordance with Mark's free method of paraphrase that he should express this technical and metaphorical word by its recognized equivalent in the Christian church, viz. "the Spirit." This would be all the more natural as the Hebrew "winnowing-fan" is derived from "breath," or "spirit," and the two words (נַחַשׁ and מַר) are somewhat similar.



purification of water and repentance ; but if ye do not works worthy of repentance there cometh One mightier than I who will baptize you with the breath of God's wrath and the fire of His fury."<sup>1</sup>

[342] The next point is, that we cannot be certain that the words following "Spirit" down to "unquenchable fire" were originally intended to be regarded as an utterance of the Baptist's. There are passages in John where the Evangelist inserts, in his own person, comment hardly to be distinguished from the words of the Baptist, or of Jesus : and the Revised version now prints as a comment of Mark what the Authorised printed as words of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> The addition may very well have been a part of the Preaching of Peter—who is said to have been once a disciple of the Baptist—commenting on a passage in the earliest Gospel.

§ 4. (*Mk.*) "*rent*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*opened*"

*Mk. i. 10* (lit.).

*Mt. iii. 16.*

*Lk. iii. 21, 22.*

"He beheld the heavens in the act-of-being-rent."

"And behold the heavens *were opened*."

"It came to pass . . . that the heaven *was opened*."

[343] Probably the Hebrew Gospel contained an allusion to Isaiah "O that thou wouldst *rend* the heavens." This Mark has retained. But the Septuagint gives "open" in Isaiah. And an "open door"—sometimes "in heaven" is added—was an early Christian phrase to describe the

<sup>1</sup> It may seem that "the Holy Spirit" cannot imply "wrath" and "fury" : but that would not be the view of a Hebrew or Jewish prophet—nor indeed of a Christian Evangelist, though we should avoid such a word as "fury"—believing in a God whose eyes are "too pure to behold iniquity," and who is described as "a consuming fire." For an instance of Greek paraphrase applied to similar Hebrew metaphor, comp. Is. xxx. 27 "*his* (God's) *tongue* is as a devouring fire." LXX "*the anger of his wrath* shall devour as fire."

<sup>2</sup> Jn. iii. 16–21, 31–36 ; Mk. vii. 19 (A.V.) ". . . 'and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats,' " (R.V.) ". . . 'and goeth out into the draught.' [This he said] making all meats clean."



preparation for the Gospel. It was, therefore, natural for the Corrector to change "rent" into "opened," and for John, like Matthew and Luke, to adopt the latter.<sup>1</sup>

§ 5. (*Mk.*) "*casteth out*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*led*"

*Mk.* i. 12 (lit.).

*Mt.* iv. 1.

*Lk.* iv. 1.

"And straightway the Spirit casteth him out into the wilderness."

"Then was Jesus *led up* into the wilderness by the Spirit."

"But Jesus, ( $a_1$ ) full of the Holy Spirit, turned back ... ( $a_2$ ) and was being *led* in (or, by) the Spirit in the wilderness."

[344] The Hebrew original was "cause-to-go-forth," rendered (LXX) five times by "cast out," once by "lead to," and more than a hundred and fifty times by "lead forth."<sup>2</sup> It is characteristic of Mark that, in the desire to express the force of the divine impulse, he does not shrink from applying to Jesus here the word habitually employed to describe the "casting out" of unclean spirits. The wonder is, not that the Corrector altered it, but that it has been allowed by the scribes to survive in any Gospel.

Luke appears to have conflated a paraphrase of his own and the alteration of the Corrector.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3, Rev. iii. 8, Rev. iv. 1 "a door opened in heaven," Jn. i. 51 "the heavens opened." The word (γρη) in Is. lxiv. 1 is there rendered ἀνολξης, which doubtless facilitated the adoption of "open" instead of "rend" by Christian Evangelists. But ἀνολξης is not accurate; γρη means "tear," "cut up," "rend," but not "open." It = σχίζειν (Mark's word) (1), διασχίζειν (1), διαρρήσσειν (44).

<sup>2</sup> See Trommius' Index, κς (hiph.) = ἐκβάλλειν (5), ἐσάγειν (1), ἐξάγειν (frequ.). Comp. Judg. xiii. 25 "The Spirit of the Lord began to move him (נָפַח), which means, literally, "to strike like a bell, or an anvil." But this is quite lost in the Greek, συνεκπορεύεσθαι "to go with him" (leg. οὐδ as "pace," "to pace with him").

§ 6. (*Mk.*) "*wild beasts*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*hungered*"

Mk. i. 13.

Mt. iv. 1, 2.

Lk. iv. 2.

" . . . being  
tempted by Satan,  
and he was with the  
wild beasts."

" . . . to be  
tempted by *the devil*  
 . . . he *hungered*."

" . . . being  
tempted by *the devil*  
 . . . he *hungered*."

[345] "Satan," the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew word signifying "adversary," is preferred in St. Paul's earlier epistles, "devil" in the later ones. The Corrector followed the later usage.

[346] "With the wild beasts" was shewn (192) to indicate a Hebrew original in which "wild beasts (צִיִּים)" was likely to be confused with "fast (צוֹם)."

§ 7. (*Mk.*) "*his brother*," (*Mt.*) "*two brothers*," [(*Lk.*) "*two boats*"]

Mk. i. 16.

Mt. iv. 18.

[Lk. v. 2.<sup>1</sup>]

(a) " . . . Simon  
and Andrew the  
brother of Simon."

" . . . *two* brothers,  
Simon who is called  
Peter, and Andrew  
his brother."

" . . . *two boats*."

Compare :—

Mk. i. 19.

Mt. iv. 21.

[Lk. v. 10.]

(b) " . . . James  
the [son] of Zebedee  
and John his brother."

" . . . *two other*  
brothers James the  
[son] of Zebedee and  
John his brother."

" . . . James and  
John, sons of Zebe-  
dee, who were *part-*  
*ners* with Simon."

[347] D and SS have preserved the key to these confusions. They read, in Mk. i. 16, "Simon and Andrew

<sup>1</sup> Lk. is bracketed, because some take the narrative as referring to a different event from that recorded by Mk.—Mt. But there are sufficient grounds for believing that at all events these parts of the narrative may be parallel.

*his brother.*" Now the Hebrew consonants meaning "his brother" mean also, and not less frequently, "his brothers." But "his brothers," in the sentence, "He (*i.e.* Jesus) saw Simon and Andrew *his brothers*,"<sup>1</sup> would mean "the brothers of Jesus." This possibility had to be removed, and was removed, in three different ways, as follows:

(i) Our present Mark, in (a), followed a Hebrew marginal correction which substituted Simon's for "his," but was content to leave (b) because "the [son] of Zebedee" here prevented any ambiguity.

The Corrector wrote in Mark's margin, in Hebrew—both in (a) and in (b)—"two brothers," without the pronominal suffix "his."

[348] (ii) Matthew adopted "two brothers" in (a). But, when he came to repeat the phrase in (b), he naturally added "other,"<sup>2</sup> so as to give "two other brothers." Then he conflated this with the parallel Mark, "his brother," although the latter was now superfluous.

[349] (iii) Luke, in (a), mistook the marginal correction "two brothers" for "two vessels," the consonants for "brothers" and "shipping," or "boat," being somewhat similar.<sup>3</sup> In (b), he read "James and John *his brothers*," *i.e.* Simon's brothers, since Simon had been last mentioned. Then, he remembered that "brother" is often used in Hebrew to mean "neighbour," "companion," "partner," and consequently rendered it "partners with Simon."

<sup>1</sup> "His brother" = אחי = also "his brothers." So אחי = either "my brother" or "my brothers." Hence 1 S. xx. 29 "my brother," LXX "my brothers."

<sup>2</sup> [348a] After saying "he met two brothers," a writer might naturally feel obliged to add "more," or "other," or "again," in repeating the phrase about a second pair. If this explanation were not sufficient, we might be tempted to suppose that—the Hebrew "other" (אחר) being similar to "brother"—conflation had taken place. "Other" and "after," in Hebrew, are identical. Comp. Judg. v. 14 "after thee (אחריך)," LXX (A) "thy brother" (leg. אחיך): conversely, in 1 S. xxx. 23 "my brethren (אחי)," LXX "after" (leg. אחר).

<sup>3</sup> [349a] "Brother (אח)" is confused, in 2 S. xv. 34, with "I (אני)," and אני = "shipping." "Ship" = אניה.

On both these points Luke is probably in error.<sup>1</sup> But these, and other errors in Luke's narrative, arise not from a desire to exaggerate, or to alter on account of prejudice, but (at all events in part) from a misunderstanding of the Hebrew original.

§ 8. *Mk.'s use of the word "proclaim"*

(i) Mk. i. 38 (lit.).

Mt. iv. 23.

Lk. iv. 43.

[350] "that I may  
proclaim also there."

“proclaiming *the gospel of the kingdom.*”

"I must bring the gospel of the kingdom of God."

This is translated above, as printed in Synopticon. But more probably Matthew should be left blank above, and Mt. iv. 23 should be differently arranged, as follows :—

(ii) Mk. i. 39 (lit.).

Mt. iv. 23.

Lk. iv. 44 (lit.).

“And he came  
proclaiming into their  
synagogues.”

“ . . . teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom.”

"And he was proclaiming into the synagogues."

The fact is, that Matthew and Luke do not agree against Mark. On the contrary, Matthew deviates from Mark, and Luke follows Mark in using "proclaim" absolutely (for "proclaim the Gospel")—a rare construction in the Gospels.<sup>2</sup>

§ 9. (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*Sir,*" *om. by Mk.*

Mk. i. 40 (lit.).

Mt. viii. 2.

Lk. v. 12.

" . . . saying to him that, 'If thou wilt . . .'"

“ . . . saying, ‘*Sir,*  
if thou wilt . . . ’ ”

" . . . saying, 'Sir,  
if thou wilt . . . ' "

<sup>1</sup> The word "shipping" could perhaps hardly be used here to mean "vessels"; and "brother" could not mean "companion," in narrative, except in a few special phrases, such as, "they said, each man *to his brother*," meaning, "they said *to one another*."

<sup>2</sup> It is confined to Mk. i. 39 (Lk. iv. 44), iii. 14, and Mt. xi. 1 "*to teach and proclaim in their cities.*"



[351] The Hebraic "that," used before speech, might be omitted by the Corrector because it is superfluous. "Sir" might be inserted for seemliness. But more probably "to him that" resembled "Sir," in Hebrew, sufficiently to justify the correction.<sup>1</sup>

§ 10. (*Mk.*) "cometh" etc., (*Mt.-Lk.*) "behold"

*Mk.* i. 40.

*Mt.* viii. 2.

*Lk.* v. 12.

[352] (i) "And there cometh unto him a leper."

"And *behold* a leper approaching."

"And *behold* a man full of leprosy, and, seeing Jesus . . ."

Compare :—

*Mk.* ii. 3.

*Mt.* ix. 2.

*Lk.* v. 18.

(ii) "And they come bringing unto him . . ."

"And *behold* they brought-to him . . ."

"And *behold* men bringing . . ."

*Mk.* v. 22.

*Mt.* ix. 18.

*Lk.* viii. 41.

(iii) "And there cometh . . . and seeing him . . ."

". . . *behold* . . . having come-to- [him]."

"and *behold* there came a man."

*Mk.* ix. 4.

*Mt.* xvii. 3.

*Lk.* ix. 30.

(iv) "And there appeared to them Elias with Moses."

"And *behold* there appeared to them Moses and Elias."

"and *behold* two men . . . who were Moses and Elias."

<sup>1</sup> [351a] "To him" = לו: "that" = כי: לו is frequently interchanged with לו, as in 2 S. ix. 4 "Ammiel," Ἀμμιήλ (Α, Αμην), Neh. xi. 31 "Bethel," Βηθελ, Prov. xxxi. 1 "Lemuel," (Theod.) Περουήλ: comp. Ezek. xxvii. 16 Heb. מלכא, למלך. Authorities are not agreed as to the origin of "Belias" as a form of "Belial" (see Black's *Ency.* "Belial").

[351b] Moreover, לו is frequently interchanged with לו, so that לו כי could become first רבני and then רבי i.e. "Rabbi." And in Mk. (x. 51) "Rabbouni" is parallel to Mt.-Lk. "Sir" (κύριε).

Mk. xiv. 43.

Mt. xxvi. 47.

Lk. xxii. 47.

(v) "And straightway . . . there cometh up."

"And . . . *behold* there came."

"*behold* . . . and he went before them."

[352] "Behold" was probably in the Hebrew original, but Mark *never uses this exclamation in narrative*. Wherever "behold" occurs in a parallel passage of one, or both, of the Synoptists, introducing an *arrival*—as in the first three instances above—Mark will be found to use either (a) "comes," or—if "comes" is in the original already—(b) "straightway." In the Transfiguration—instance (iv) above—where there is no suggestion of arrival, and where "beholding" may be said to be implied in "appeared"—Mark omits "behold" and substitutes nothing for it.<sup>1</sup>

Matthew and Luke agree in adopting corrections that assimilate the Greek Gospel in this respect to the Hebrew.

[353] In the instance marked (v) above, Mark has rendered "behold" by "straightway." This rendering occurs thrice in Genesis, and appears to have been a kind of experiment in free translation, which the Septuagint did not continue. This form of "straightway" occurs only four times in the whole of the Septuagint. Mark repeatedly employs it.<sup>2</sup>

§ 11. (Mk.) "*by four*," (Mt.—Lk.) "*on a bed*"

Mk. ii. 3.

Mt. ix. 2.

Lk. v. 18.

" . . . a paralytic carried by four."

" . . . a paralytic prostrate *on a bed*."

" . . . *on a bed* a man that was paralysed."

<sup>1</sup> [352a] Note that in (i) and (iii), Luke and Mark severally add clauses about "seeing." These may be conflations arising from Greek corruption. A marginal *ιδου* is easily confused with *ιδω* (i.e. *ιδων*) and transferred to the text.

<sup>2</sup> [353a] Gen. xv. 4, xxiv. 45, xxxviii. 29, *εὐθὺς* = *תחלה*. The only other instance is Job iii. 11, where there is no Hebrew equivalent. Mark has much in common with the style of translation adopted in Genesis. For another possible instance of idiosyncrasy in translation, confined to a single book of the LXX, see 313a.

[354] See *Clue* (196-205), where it was shewn that a Hebrew original "at a trap-door-in-the-roof" may have been mistaken for "by four," and also for "on a bed." The latter was adopted by Matthew and Luke.

§ 12. (*Mk.*) "*before them*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*to his house*"

*Mk.* ii. 12.

*Mt.* ix. 7, 8.

*Lk.* v. 25, 26.

"He went out before [them] all . . . , they were amazed."

"He went away to his house . . . they feared."

" . . . before their faces . . . he went away to his house . . . and amazement seized all and they were filled with fear."

(i) "*before them*"

[355] The original may have been, "He went out *between* them all," that is to say, between the crowded congregation, which made way so as to allow him to pass. The word meaning "between" is easily confused, and has actually been confused in the Septuagint, with the much more common word "house," as, for example, in Proverbs "*Among* the righteous," LXX "*the houses* of the righteous."<sup>1</sup> Mark gives a free but correct translation, taking "between" to mean "in the midst of," "in the full view of." Matthew adopts the corrupt reading "house." Luke conflates "house" with a slightly different form ("before their faces") of Mark's "before them all."

(ii) "*they were amazed*"

[356] Mark has perhaps paraphrased the original Hebrew "fear," thinking that "amazement" would better express

<sup>1</sup> [355a] Prov. xiv. 9 "among, (בין)" οἰκταί: Sir. xlii. 12 "in the house-of (בית) (ἐν μέσῳ)," where Editors say (p. xxxi.) "perh. 'among' contr. for בית: so Ez. xli. 9 (δ) and perh. Prov. viii. 2, Job viii. 17." In these three passages LXX has ἐν μέσῳ, or ἀνὰ μέσον.

the feeling consequent on a beneficent act. Matthew has restored "fear." Luke has conflated "fear" and "amazement."

In Mark iv. 41 "they feared a great fear," Matthew has "wondered," while Luke conflates "fear" and "wonder" (138).

### § 13. *The Exclamatory Interrogative*

Mk. ii. 16.

Mt. ix. 11.

Lk. v. 30.

"that he eateth  
. . ."

"*Why* eateth  
your teacher . . .?"

"*Why* eat ye  
. . .?"

[357] When a question is not asked for information but is of the nature of an exclamation, the Septuagint often expresses the Hebrew interrogative particle by "that" (perhaps sometimes meaning "how is it that"). In such cases, the Codex Alexandrinus, which is inferior in antiquity to the Codex Vaticanus, very frequently corrects the text so as to conform it more exactly to the Hebrew. This phenomenon of the Old Testament reproduces itself here in the New. Mark has rendered the Hebrew interrogative in the old inaccurate fashion, whereas Matthew and Luke have adopted a later but more accurate translation. In two other passages (where Luke has no parallel) Mark expresses a question by "that," and the parallel Matthew has "why?"<sup>1</sup>

### § 14. (*Mk.*) "*seweth on*," (*Mt.*—*Lk.*) "*putteth on*"

Mk. ii. 21.

Mt. ix. 16.

Lk. v. 36.

"no man . . .  
seweth-on."

"no man *putteth*-  
*on*."

"no man *putteth*-  
*on*."

<sup>1</sup> [357a] Mk. (a) ix. 11, (b) ix. 28  $\delta\tau\iota$ , Mt. (a)  $\tau\iota$ , (b)  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\iota$ . Comp. 2 S. xii. 9 "Wherefore? (מָה)  $\delta\tau\iota$  (A  $\tau\iota$ ), Job xxvii. 12 "Why then? (לָמָּה) (where A has  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\iota$ , but the older MSS. read  $\delta\tau\iota$  and connect it with what precedes): Ex. iii. 3 "why (מָה),  $\delta\tau\iota$  (A. F.  $\tau\iota\ \delta\tau\iota$ ): Judg. ii. 2 "But ye have not hearkened unto my voice: *why* (מָה) have ye done this?" LXX "ye have not hearkened *because* ( $\delta\tau\iota$ ) (but A "*when*,"  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ ) ye did this": Judg. iv. 14 "Is not (הֲלֹא) the Lord gone out . . .?"  $\delta\tau\iota$  (but A  $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\chi\ \text{i}\delta\omicron\upsilon$ )  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  . . . There are many more such instances.



[358] This correction probably originated in Greek corruption. The original Hebrew had "seweth." But the Greek of this (ράπτει) is convertible, by the alteration of a single letter, into "throweth (ρίπτει)"; and the two Greek words are thus confused in Job.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Mark's compound, "seweth-on," is not found in the whole of Greek literature. It was therefore probably altered to "throweth-on." But this, since it implied violence, was not so appropriate as "putteth on," which was therefore generally adopted by later Evangelists.

### § 15. "The wine-skins"

Mk. ii. 22.

Mt. ix. 17.

Lk. v. 37, 38.

[359] "Else,<sup>2</sup> the wine will tear the wine-skins, and the wine is destroyed and the wine-skins [too]. [[But [people must put] new wine into new wine-skins]]."<sup>3</sup>

"Or-else, the wine-skins are torn and the wine *is spilt* and the wine-skins destroyed. But [people] *put* new wine into new wine-skins."

"Or-else, the new wine will tear the wine-skins, and will itself *be spilt*, and the wine-skins will be destroyed. But *one-should-put* new wine into new wine-skins."

<sup>1</sup> "Sew (רפא)" occurs (4) in O.T. = (3) ράπτω, (1) συνράπτω. In Job xvi. 15 (LXX 16) "I have *sewed*" (רפא) ἔραψαν, there are v.r. ἐραψαν, ἐριψαν, ἐρριψαν. In the present passage, D reads ἐπισυνραπτει. This was caused by some scribe who—aware that συν- was allowable and ἐπι- was not—wrote συν in the margin, which D conflated.

"Putteth-on (ἐπιβάλλει)" might mean "throweth, or, casteth on," so that it is closely synonymous with ἐπιρίπτει "throweth on."

If the above explanation is correct, ἐπιράπτει was altered to ἐπιρίπτει which was replaced by the synonymous ἐπιβάλλει; and the intermediate phase of tradition, ἐπιρίπτει, is no longer extant.

<sup>2</sup> [359a] "Else." Mk. εἰ δὲ μὴ, Mt.-Lk. εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, see below on Mk. ii. 26. Mk. never uses γε. It occurs only thrice in the whole of the Pentateuch. The omission of γε leaves the reader free to translate thus: "But, if the wine should not tear." The insertion therefore conduces to clearness.

<sup>3</sup> These words, omitted by Tisch. and bracketed by W. H., are retained by SS, which however adds "put." The sentence may have been omitted by some scribes owing to its ungrammatical structure. If it was an interpolation, why did the interpolator omit "put"?

[360] In this case, Greek corruption will best explain the divergences from Mark. The original Greek was probably, "Else, the wine will tear the wine-skins and (καί) *is destroyed* (ἀπόλλυται) *also* (or, and) (καί) *itself* (αὐτός)." But "is destroyed" and "are destroyed" in Greek MSS. are often distinguished by nothing but a horizontal line of abbreviation over one letter (ἀπολλυται and ἀπολλῦται).<sup>1</sup> Again, the Greek "also" may mean "and also"; and the Greek "itself" by the change of a letter may mean "they." Hence arose the following variations.

(1) Mark took the words as meaning "and it *is* destroyed *and also they* [are destroyed]," and inserted or substituted *nouns* for pronouns to make this clear: "and *the wine* is destroyed and also *the wine-skins*."

(2) Matthew and Luke followed the interpretation "*are* destroyed." This left the sentence incomplete, thus: "Else the wine will tear the wine-skins and they *are* destroyed, and itself . . ." To make this clear, "the wine is spilt," or "the wine itself will be spilt," was inserted in the margin, and afterwards transferred to the text.

If the words enclosed in double brackets in Mark are genuine, it is easy to see why Evangelists added a missing verb, variously supplied by Matthew ("put") and Luke ("should-put").

§ 15 (a). (Mt.-Lk.) "*eating*," Mk. omits

Mk. ii. 23.

Mt. xii. 1.

Lk. vi. 1.

[360] (i) " . . . and his disciples began to make a way, plucking the ears."

" . . . but his disciples were hungry and began to pluck ears *and eat*."

" . . . and his disciples were plucking the ears *and eating*, rubbing [them] with their hands."

<sup>1</sup> [360a] This is a very frequent cause of Greek corruption. The abbreviation is confined, in the oldest uncial MSS., to letters at, or near, the end of the line. But the lines are so short that, in spite of this limitation, the contraction occurs, for example, in κ, (Lk. vii. 21) twice in seven words, (Lk. vii. 22) thrice in eight, (Lk. vii. 4) twice in four.

See *Clue*, 211-218, where the passage and the context are discussed. Matthew and Luke omit Mark's difficult phrase (*i.e.* "making a way"): and, by adding that the disciples "ate," they meet, by anticipation, the charge of wanton trespass necessarily implied in any exact interpretation of Mark's words.

§ 16. (*Mk.*) "*except*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*except alone*"

Mk. ii. 26.

Mt. xii. 4.

Lk. vi. 4.

"... except (lit. if not) the priests."

"... except (lit. if not) to the priests alone."

"... except (lit. if not) *alone* the priests."

[361] As in Mk. ii. 22, so here, the Corrector disliked the use of "if not," to mean "except," without some addition to signify that "if" is not used as a conditional conjunction. There, he added a Greek particle ("at least"), here he adds "alone." Similarly in the parallel to Mk. xiii. 32 "except the Father," Mt. xxiv. 36 adds "alone."

§ 17. (*Mk.*) "*plagues*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*diseases*"

Mk. iii. 10.

Mt. iv. 24.

Lk. vi. 17.

"plagues (lit. strokes)."

"*diseases*."

"*diseases*."

[362] The difference shews Mark adhering to the custom of the Septuagint, which seldom uses the regular Greek word for "disease." Mark thrice uses "stroke (μάστιξ)" and only once "disease (νόσος)"; Matthew "disease" five times, "stroke" never; Luke "disease" four times, "stroke" once. In classical Greek, Mark's word might mean "a plague" or "a scourge." It would naturally be corrected by later Evangelists.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [362a] Mark may have had in view the Hebrew of Is. liii. 4 R. V. "carried our sorrows (כַּבְּדֵנוּ)," LXX "sorroweth for us." This word = (1) μάστιξ, (2) μαλακία, but never νόσος. The root is said to mean "pierce" (comp. Ezek.

§ 18. *The naming of the Apostles*

Mk. iii. 14 foll.

"and he appointed Twelve, whom also he named Apostles, . . . and he appointed the Twelve and set a name on Simon [? namely] Peter, and James the [son] of Zebedee and John the brother of James (and he set names on them [namely] Boanerges, which is Sons of Thunder) and Andrew and Philip . . ."

Mt. x. 2.

"But of the Twelve Apostles the names are these, first Simon who is called Peter and Andrew *his brother* and James the [son] of Zebedee and John his brother, Philip . . ."

Lk. vi. 13-14.

"... Twelve whom also he named Apostles, Simon whom also he named Peter and Andrew *his brother*, and James and John and Philip . . ."

[363] Mark shews signs of confusion. Possibly he had before him two accounts, one (*a*) of the "appointing," the other (*b*) of the "naming," of the Apostles: and he may have combined the two by means of parentheses. If so, the former (*a*) may have originally had "Simon and Andrew his brother," and Mark may have omitted "his brother" when he altered the order by *placing first those apostles who received new names*.<sup>1</sup>

xxviii. 24 "*a grieving* (כאב) thorn"), hence "soreness," "pain": comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7 "*thorn in the flesh*" (marg. "stake"). But more probably the original was נגע "stroke," ἀφῆ (69), μάστιξ (3), πληγῆ (2), applied to the Messiah in Is. liii. 4 "we did esteem him *stricken* of God," (liii. 8) "for the transgression of my people was he *stricken*," where the LXX paraphrases, or errs.

<sup>1</sup> [363*a*] Near this point, parallel to Mk. iii. 19-21, Mr. Rushbrooke's Synopticon places the cure of a dumb (Mt. adds "and blind") demoniac (Mt. xii. 22, 23, Lk. xi. 14). Another cure of a dumb demoniac (more similar to that in Lk. xi. 14) is found in Mt. ix. 32, 33. In neither is the similarity between Mt. and Lk. very close. They are not discussed here as they are not in Mk.

[363*b*] There follows a passage about "Satan casting out Satan," which belongs, at least in part, to the Double Tradition. Mk. (iii. 21-26) is so confused



§ 19. (Mk.) "*parables*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*thoughts*" or  
"*purposes*"

Mk. iii. 23.

Mt. xii. 25.

Lk. xi. 17.

"And having called them unto [himself] in parables he began-to-say to them."

"But *knowing their inward-thoughts* he said to them."

"But he, *knowing their purposes*, said to them."

[364] These words, in Matthew, immediately follow the slander of the Pharisees that Jesus cast out devils "in Beelzebub the prince of the devils."

In Mark, they follow a similar slander proceeding from scribes. But Mark's expression "And having called them to [himself]," a phrase elsewhere used when Jesus calls the disciples or the people round Him, is quite inappropriate as introducing a rebuke to enemies. Luke, on the other hand, interposes, between the Beelzebub-slander and xi. 17, "But others, tempting, began-to-see from him a sign out of heaven." This seems to explain the meaning of Luke's word "*purposes*." He is not referring to mere "*inward-thoughts*" of hostility, but to "*purposes*," or "*intrigues*," on the part of the Pharisees, to discredit Jesus with the people, by taking advantage of a refusal, or a failure, to work a sign from heaven.

The phenomena indicate two opposite interpretations of

that, though it differs greatly from Mt. and Lk., the author of the Arabic Diatessaron does not attempt (as he generally does) to add it to the two others. The steps of investigation cannot be given here, but the results may be stated thus. The original was to this effect: "If Satan stand (סָק=stand up) against Satan, shall he be able (leg. יָכַל "to be able") to stand (סָק=stand fast)? He shall not be able, but shall come-to-an-end (leg. כָּלָה, which, in some forms, is identical with יָכַל)." Confusion was caused by (i) the use of "stand" in the two senses of "rebel" and "prosper"; (ii) the identity of the words signifying "able" and "come-to-an-end" or "be-destroyed"; (iii) the similarity of the words in (ii) to the word "all (כָּל)" (which is inserted in Mt.-Lk. but not in Mk.); and (iv) the identity between "if" and the interrogative ("If Satan . . .," "Can Satan . . .?").

a Hebrew original latent under Mark's "having called them unto [himself]" and "parables."

- (i) (*Mk.*) "*having called them unto [himself],*" (*Mt.-Lk.*)  
*"knowing"*

[365] Since Mark's "having called them unto [himself]" is probably erroneous, it is reasonable to prefer hypothetically the version of Matthew and Luke, "knowing," as a basis for an attempt to return to the Hebrew. The usual Hebrew word for "know" could hardly give rise to Mark's divergence, but a Hebrew word meaning "know," "have understanding," etc., is easily confused with another meaning "cause to come," which might be freely paraphrased "call to oneself," and the two are once actually confused by the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

Mark may have been led into this error, partly by the much greater frequency of the word "come," but partly by the Hebrew idiom "know *in*," used like "have knowledge, or understanding *in*."<sup>2</sup> The preposition "*in*," being connected by him with the following word rendered by him "parables," led him to detach the word now under consideration from "began to speak in parables," and to find some other meaning for it.

(ii) *Parables*

[366] If the Hebrew original of "parables" had been the usual word, *Mashal*, so familiar a term could hardly have created difficulty. But there was another Hebrew word meaning "dark sayings," and capable of meaning "intrigues," and translated by Matthew "secret things" when he quotes—as a prediction of Christ's teaching in parables—"I will open

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Dan. ix. 22 "and he *instructed* me" hiph. of בִּין, LXX προσηλάθε, leg. בוא.

<sup>2</sup> [365a] Comp. Ezr. viii. 15 "I *viewed* the people"; lit. "had-understanding *in* the people," and translated thus (συνῆκα ἐν) by the LXX; but the parall. 1 Esd. viii. 41 has "I reviewed (κατέμαθον) them."

my mouth in a parable, I will utter *dark-sayings* of old." It is generally rendered by the Septuagint "problem," but Mark, in his free paraphrastic style, might naturally render it "parable": and Matthew, since he rendered it "secret things" elsewhere, might very well render it "inward thoughts" here.<sup>1</sup> In Daniel (viii. 23) it is rendered by the Revised Version "dark sentences," but the Oxford edition of Gesenius renders it "double-dealing," which is very similar to Luke's meaning here. On the whole, it is probable that Mark is wrong, and Matthew and Luke right, here as well as in the preceding paragraph. No doubt, theoretically, the original—differing from the present text of all the Gospels—might have been "While teaching them in dark sayings." But, if this was the original, why should it be altered? Indeed, there would be a strong inducement to retain it, for it might be regarded as a fulfilment of the words of the Psalmist, "I will utter dark sayings." The agreement of Matthew and Luke is also an argument for the correctness of their version—in cases where, as here, no "scandal" is removed by the correction.<sup>2</sup>

### § 20. *The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit*

Mk. iii. 28, 29.

Mt. xii. 31, 32.

Lk. xii. 10.

(a <sub>1</sub> ) "all things shall be forgiven to the sons of men	(a <sub>1</sub> ) "every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men;	(a <sub>2</sub> ) "and every one that shall say a word against (lit. to)
--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> [366a] Ps. lxxviii. 2 "dark sayings (חֲדָרִים)," προβλήματα, quoted in Mt. xiii. 35 κερκυμένα: Dan. viii. 23 "understanding *dark sentences*" (Lexic. Gesen. Oxf., "double-dealing"). In LXX, חֲדָרִים = αἰνίγμα (4), διήγημα (-ησις) (2), πρόβλημα (10).

<sup>2</sup> [366b] Another explanation is, that Mk. read the familiar ἔσω ("parable") instead of ἔμεν ("treachery"). The letters γ and σ are often interchanged in LXX, as may be seen from the *Oxford Concordance of Names*; see Σαβαδών, Σαδών (A), Σαϊλάμ, Σαλαιμάθ, etc., in all of which the initial letter is γ, read by the LXX as σ. For an instance of ἔσω read as ἔμεν, see 2 K. vi. 11 "of us (ὁ ἔμεν)," LXX "betrays (προδίδωσιν)."



—their sins and their blasphemies, as many blasphemies as they utter— but who-so shall blaspheme against (lit. to) the Holy Spirit, hath not forgiveness . . .”

but the blasphemy against (lit. of) the Spirit shall not be forgiven. (*a*<sub>2</sub>) And whoso shall say a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven to him; but whoso shall say [a word] against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven to him.”

*the Son of man*, it shall be forgiven him; but to him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven.”

[367] Compare a passage in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, warning Christians not to judge a prophet speaking in the Spirit, “for *every sin* shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven.”<sup>1</sup>

[368] In the original Hebrew Gospel, “sons of man (Adam)” probably occurred in all cases where “men” stands in passages of warning or reproof, such as that in Matthew, “Every idle word that *men* shall speak,” where the modern Hebrew of Delitzsch has “the sons of man (Adam).” But when “son of man,” in Christian documents, came to mean exclusively Jesus, Evangelists must have found the term “sons of man” incongruous in the old application. The natural course was to substitute the idiomatic Greek equivalent, “men.” But in a few cases the old phrase might be retained with the singular changed to the plural, “sons of men.” The survival of the latter here alone in Mark is a proof of its extreme antiquity, and the parallel passages must be regarded as early corrections of it.

[369] (i) The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles took the obvious course of omitting “to the sons of man,” and of

<sup>1</sup> Didach. xi. 7 προφήτην λαλῶντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε· πᾶσα γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφεθήσεται, αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἁμαρτία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.



condensing "all things . . . their sins and their blasphemies" into "every sin."<sup>1</sup>

(ii) The Corrector of Mark took "*to the sons of man*" as "*against*"<sup>2</sup> the *Son of man*," so that the meaning became, "All things shall be forgiven—that is to say, *against the Son of man*, whether sins of word or deed."

(iii) Matthew, in the second ( $a_2$ ) of his versions, and Luke in his single version, adopted the Corrector's view, but took "things" as meaning "words"—a constant confusion in Hebrew. Hence the meaning became "All *words* shall be forgiven uttered *against the Son of man*"; and, as the meaning was now confined to "words," they dropped the addition ("*sins and blasphemies*") intended to include deed as well as word.

(iv) Matthew conflated with this a version of Mark ( $a_1$ ), substituting "men" for "sons of men," and making the order somewhat more regular.

§ 20 (a). (*Mk*) "*the (men) about him with the Twelve*,"  
(*Mt.-Lk.*) "*the disciples*"

Mk. iv. 10.

Mt. xiii. 10.

Lk. viii. 9.

"And when he            "And        having            "But there-began-  
was alone there-be-    come to him    *the*    to-question him his

<sup>1</sup> [369a] In Hebrew "thing" and "word" are identical. Comp. Dan. ii. 10, LXX  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha$ , Theod.  $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ ; Ezr. x. 4  $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ =1 Esdr. viii. 91  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha$ ; Ezr. x. 16  $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ =1 Esdr. ix. 16  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha$ . Hence a Hebrew writer, after saying "Every thing," might feel it needful to add "yes, whether *deed* or *word*," to shew that "*thing*" was not intended here to mean "*word*" alone. Comp. 2 Chr. xiii. 22 (lit.) "the rest of the *words* (דברים) of A., and [or, both] his *ways* (דרכי) and his *words* (דברים)," LXX "the rest of the *words* (λόγοι) of A., and [or, both] his *acts* (πράξεις) and his *words* (λόγοι)."

This explains Mark's diffuse language "all things . . . their *sins* [*i.e.* of *act*] and *blasphemies* [*i.e.* of *word*]"—which was quite needless in Greek, and was consequently dropped by later Evangelists.

<sup>2</sup> [369b] For the interchange of "to" and "against," comp. Mk. vi. 11  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \muαρτύριον \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ =Lk. ix. 5  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \muαρτύριον \epsilon\pi' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ .  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\pi\iota$  are frequently interchanged in LXX, and  $\text{לֵּא$  and  $\text{בֵּי}$  in Hebrew.

gan-to-ask him ( $a_1$ ) *disciples* said to him, *disciples* What this those [that were] Why in parables parable was ( $\epsilon\lambda\eta$ ).” about him ( $a_2$ ) with speakest - thou to the Twelve the [mean- them ?” ing of the] parables.”

[370] Mark's phrase “the (*men*) about,” meaning “the (*men*) attending, or, accompanying (a person),” is a sign of free Greek translation or paraphrase. In the LXX, it is extremely rare, and never used except in a paraphrase, interpolation, or conflation.<sup>1</sup> Here, as in the only passage where it occurs in the historical books of O.T., it is probably part of a conflation. An original ( $a_1$ ) “those who [were] with-him”—a very frequent expression in Hebrew to mean “his followers”—might be interpreted in two quite distinct senses, either as the smaller circle of ( $a_2$ ) “the Twelve,” or as the larger circle of Christ's “disciples.” Mark has conflated ( $a_1$ ) and ( $a_2$ ). The Corrector adopted “disciples.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [370a] In Heb. LXX it occurs six times with a person (once with  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ), of which four are in Ezek. xxxviii. 6, 9 and xxxix. 4, to represent a word peculiar to Ezekiel, אנפיה, wings, or flanks of an army. In 1 Chr. xxviii. 1  $\text{ol } \pi\epsilon\pi\lambda \tau\acute{o} \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  is a paraphrase for שר “attend on,” “minister to.” In Sir. xlv. 18  $\epsilon \delta\upsilon\delta\epsilon\varsigma \text{ ol } \pi\epsilon\pi\lambda \Delta\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu$  represents “The-men-of Dathan.” In 2 S. xv. 18  $\text{ol } \pi\epsilon\pi\lambda$  occurs as part of a triple conflate (75) rendering “עבדים (servants)” and is probably intended to distinguish David's *personal* attendants from his warriors. In Dan iii. 23 (LXX), iii. 49 (LXX and Theod.), it occurs in Greek additions.

<sup>2</sup> [370b] Possibly Mark's “when he was alone” may be a third member of this conflation, springing from an original “those-who [were] about him.” For “when” and “who” are easily interchangeable in Hebrew, e.g. 1 K. viii. 30, 2 Chr. vi. 21 “when,”  $\delta$ ; 1 K. viii. 9, 2 Chr. v. 10 (R.V. txt.) “when,” (marg.) “where,”  $\delta$ , i.e. “in the things which.” Consequently—taking “those-who [were] about him” to mean “when [they-were] about him,” i.e. “when they were with him by themselves, apart from the multitude”—a free translator might render this “when he was alone” (or perhaps “when they-were ( $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ ) alone,” corrupted to “when he-was ( $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron$ ).”). But the discussion of this question must be reserved for a commentary on the Triple Tradition. See Mk. iv. 34, “But privately to his own disciples he used-to-explain all things”—a passage omitted by Matthew and Luke.

§ 21. (*Mk.*) "*into them*," (*Mt.*) "*in his heart*," (*Lk.*)  
*"from their heart"*

*Mk.* iv. 15 (lit.).

*Mt.* xiii. 19.

*Lk.* viii. 12.

"taketh away the  
word that hath been  
sown *into them*."

"snatcheth that  
which hath been  
sown *in his heart*."

"taketh away the  
word *from their*  
*heart*."

(i) "*Heart*"

[370 (i)] The original may have been "taketh away the word [that was] in their heart." Hebrew, like English, frequently omits the relative, where either that, or a participle (*e.g.* "sown") must be expressed in Greek. "In-the-heart-of," "from-the-heart-of," are frequently rendered in the Septuagint by the prepositions "in" and "from."<sup>1</sup> Mark perhaps wrote "into them" in order to avoid "*in them*," since the latter might mean "*among them*" (an ambiguity sometimes found in the Pauline "*in you*"). Matthew and Luke return to the literal Hebrew, "heart."

(ii) (*Mk.-Mt.*) "*in(to)*," (*Lk.*) "*from*"

[371] This is a frequent variation (158*a*). Compare Lam. i. 15 "he hath set at naught . . . *in the midst of me*," LXX "he hath taken away . . . *from the midst of me*," Gen. xxxv. 2 "Put away the strange gods that [are] *among you*," LXX "take away the strange gods *from the midst of you*." Reading "from," Luke would of course not require a relative or a participle.

§ 22. *Interrogatives*

*Mk.* iv. 21.

*Mt.* v. 15.

*Lk.* viii. 16.

(i) "Doth the  
lamp come?"

"Nor do men  
light a lamp."

"But no one,  
having kindled a  
lamp."

<sup>1</sup> See Tromm. index under קרב and לב.

Mk. vi. 37.

(ii) "Are we to go away and buy . . . ?"

Mt. xiv. 15.

"that they may go away . . . and buy . . ."

Lk. ix. 13.

"unless we are to go and buy . . ."

Mk. viii. 12.

(iii) "Why seeketh this generation a sign? Verily I say, (lit.) *if*<sup>1</sup> a sign shall be given to this generation."

Mt. xvi. 4.

"An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and a sign shall not be given to it except the sign of Jonah."

Lk. xi. 29.

"This generation is an evil generation. It seeketh a sign, and a sign shall not be given to it except the sign of Jonah."

Mk. xi. 22.

(iv) R.V. "Have faith in God" (but ? better, "Have ye faith in God?")

Mt. xxi. 21.

"If ye have faith . . ."

[Lk. xvii. 6.<sup>2</sup>]

"If ye have faith . . ."

Mk. xi. 32.

(v) "But are we to say From men?"

Mt. xxi. 26.

"But *if* we say From men . . ."

Lk. xx. 6.

"But *if* we say From men . . ."

Mk. xiv. 61.

(vi) "Thou [then] art the Christ?"

Mt. xxvi. 63.

". . . that thou wouldst tell us *if* thou art the Christ."

Lk. xxii. 67.

"*If* thou art the Christ tell us."

[372] These variations could not occur in Greek, where interrogation is almost always clearly distinguished from assertion; but they could easily occur in Hebrew, where sometimes the interrogative is expressed (*a*) by mere tone, (*b*) by a prefix identical with the article (often, as in (i) above,

<sup>1</sup> [371*a*] Mk. viii. 12 lit. "if." "If," when thus used in Hebrew, may be explained by "The Lord do so unto me" implied before it. R.V. here has the negative without a marginal explanation; but in Hebr. iii. 11, iv. 3 "They shall *not* enter," it has marg. "Gr. *if* they shall enter."

<sup>2</sup> Luke is bracketed, as the context is very different from that of Matthew, so that the parallelism is doubtful.



equivalent to a negation), (c) by "if" (in which case it may amount, as in (iii) above, to a strong negation). As a result of (c), the Greek "if" is frequently used interrogatively in the Septuagint, and this may explain the variations in (iv), (v), (vi).

In (ii), a Hebrew original of Mark's "*Are we to go away?*" might be rendered in Greek either literally by "*If (εἰ) we are to go away,*" or, more classically, by a negative interrogative: "*Surely we are not (μὴ) to go away?*" Luke seems to have combined "if" and "not," reading "*if we are not,*" i.e. "*unless we are [to go away].*" Some confusion appears to have caused Matthew to apply the phrase, not to the disciples, but to the multitude ("that they may go away").<sup>1</sup>

In (iv), Mark himself probably means "have" to be taken imperatively (as R.V.); but the parallelism of Matthew and Luke suggests that the writer of the original Hebrew meant the sentence either interrogatively ("Have ye faith in God? Then shall ye obtain your petitions") or else conditionally ("If ye have faith").

§ 23. (Mk.) "*come,*" (Mt.) "*light,*" (Lk.) "*kindle*"

Mk. iv. 21.

Mt. v. 15.

Lk. viii. 16.

"Doth the lamp  
come?"

"Nor do [men]  
*light* a lamp . . ."

"But no one *hav-*  
*ing kindled* a lamp."

[373] See *Clue* (186) where it was shewn that this divergence might be explained by a confusion of the Hebrew words "come" and "kindle."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [372a] This might arise from throwing Direct Speech ("should we go away?") into Indirect Speech. "The disciples said *Should they* go away?" The latter might easily become, "the disciples said they [*the multitude*] should go away." Moreover, the Hebrew 1st pers. pl. fut. active is easily and frequently confused with the 3rd pers. pl. past passive.

<sup>2</sup> [373a] Comp. Ex. xiv. 20 "yet it gave light (אור)," και δὲ ἠέλειεν (?) leg. ראו, but see 186a). In 2 S. xxii. 29 "thou [art] my lamp," the parall. Ps. xviii. 28

§ 24. (Mk.) "save that it may be," (Mt.-Lk.) "that shall not be"

Mk. iv. 22.

"For ( $a_1$ ) there is not [anything] hidden save *that* it may be manifested, ( $a_2$ ) nor-yet did [anything] become hidden away but that it may come into manifest[ation]."

Mt. x. 26.

"For ( $a_1$ ) there is nothing covered *that* shall not be uncovered, ( $a_2$ ) and hidden *that* shall not be known . . ."

Lk. viii. 17.

"For ( $a_1$ ) there is not [anything] hidden *that* shall not become manifest, ( $a_2$ ) nor-yet hidden away *that* shall not surely ( $\text{o}\dot{\upsilon}\mu\eta$ ) ( $b_1$ ) be-known and ( $b_2$ ) come into manifest[ation]."

(i) (Mk.) "that" (Conj.); (Mt.-Lk.) "that" (Rel.)

[373 (i)] The Hebrew relative is often translated by the Greek "in-order-that" used here by Mark: Gen. xxii. 14 "as

inserts "wilt kindle (אחיר)," perh. dropped in 2 S. owing to the proximity of the similar אהה preceding, and the similar ניר following.

[373<sup>b</sup>] The confusion might also be otherwise explained. The regular word to express the "lighting" of the lamps of the tabernacle means literally "cause to go up," *hiph.* of עלה. It is interpr. (Gesen. Oxf.) "make flame go up," but "Thes. al. of *raising lamp* upon the lamp-stand," Ex. xxv. 37, xxvii. 20, etc. The R. V. gives both renderings; so does the LXX, in one instance having Numb. viii. 2, 3 "put (ἐπιτίθης)" and "lighted (ἐξήψεν)" in consecutive verses. Now עלה is rendered by many Greek verbs of motion, and, among others, by εἰσπορεύομαι (1), ἐπέρχομαι (3), ἔρχομαι (1), ἤκω (1), παρέρχομαι (1). It is therefore easy to suppose that the Hebrew original "Doth [one] *cause* the lamp to go up" was rendered by Mark wrongly "Doth the lamp *come* [into the room]" and altered rightly by the Corrector to "No man *lighteth* the lamp."

[373<sup>c</sup>] This view is somewhat confirmed by a conflation in א of Tobit viii. 13. Codex B has "And the maid-servant entered"; but א ( $a_1$ ) And they *sent* the maid-servant ( $a_2$ ) and *lighted* the lamp." The Heb. is not extant: but probably א has conflated עלה "caused to go up" with "lighted," and also נערה "maid-servant" (dropping נ) with נר or ניר "lamp."

[373<sup>d</sup>] Another verb of motion confused with "light" is יצא "go forth," apparently confused with יאח "light" in Jerem. xxi. 12 "go forth," LXX "kindled (ἀναφθῆ)," and Sir. xxxii. 16 "shall bring forth," LXX "shall *kindle* as light," ἐξάψουσιν ὡς φῶς (unless this is a Greek error for ἐξόλουσιν). To explain Mk. iv. 21, however, יצא meaning "go forth" is not so appropriate as עלה or בוא: for a word is needed that may mean "come in."

it (lit. *which*) is said," LXX "*that* they may say," Sir. xlv. 24 "*which* should be," LXX "*that* it may be," Sir. xlvii. 13c "*who* established," LXX "*that* he may establish." Probably, therefore, Mark is giving a free translation of the Hebrew relative. He perhaps took the meaning to be "There is nothing hidden that *is not destined to be, i.e. intended by Providence to be, manifested.*" This might imply *purpose*: "It is only hidden for a time *in order that* it may be manifested later with better effect." If this is a correct explanation of the divergence, Matthew and Luke are returning to the Hebrew original. But see 373 (ii) b.

(ii) *Mk.* "*come into manifestation*"; *Mt.* substitutes, *Lk.* adds, "*be known*"<sup>1</sup>

[373 (ii)] In Mark's version, "save that it may be manifested . . . *but that it may come into manifest[ation]*," the last clause is so uncouth and tautological that its alteration by a Corrector is not surprising. But the very uncouthness makes it probable that it is a literal translation from Hebrew.

Luke's rendering appears to conflate the harsh "come into manifest[ation]" with the smooth paraphrase "be known," and, so far, to be inaccurate; but his "*nor [anything] that shall not surely*" may guide us to the Hebrew if it represents, as it may very well do, an attempt to render the emphasis implied in the Hebrew reduplicated verb: "there is nothing hidden, but *it shall manifest be manifested,*" i.e. 'but it shall surely be manifested.'<sup>2</sup>

Now a Hebrew word for "manifest" (literally "unveil,"

<sup>1</sup> Lk. xii. 2, in the Double Tradition, gives a doublet, agreeing exactly with the last words of Mt. ". . . that shall not be uncovered, and hidden that shall not *be-known.*"

<sup>2</sup> [373 (ii) a] The LXX frequently drops the Heb. Reduplicated verb, or varies it, or detaches the two forms, or confuses one of them with a similar word so as to avoid reduplication, Gen. xlv. 4, Josh. vii. 7, 1 S. xx. 3, Judg. v. 23 (B), (A, as frequently, gives the Heb.), Judg. xv. 2, etc.



“reveal”) means also “remove,” “depart,” and is frequently rendered by the LXX “am led,” “remove,” and once “come into.”<sup>1</sup> Hence “manifest be manifested” might be wrongly rendered “come into manifestation.”<sup>2</sup> But, for various reasons, this particular confusion—especially as it is supported by only one instance from the LXX—is not highly probable. It is probable, however, that some error of this kind, some harsh and inaccurate attempt at a faithful rendering of Hebrew, has given rise to a correction “be known,” conflated by Luke in the Triple Tradition, and substituted by him in the Double, as also by Matthew here.<sup>3</sup>

### § 25. *The mustard-seed*

Mk. iv. 30–32.

Mt. xiii. 31, 32.

Lk. xiii. 18.

[374] (a) “How “<sup>4</sup>*Like is the king-* “<sup>4</sup>To what is the  
are we to liken<sup>4</sup> the dom of the heaven to kingdom of God like

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. xiv. 11 “Both of them *discovered-themselves* (גלה),” LXX “both went in (εἰσῆλθον).” This may be intended for a paraphrase. And so may “come” in Mk.

<sup>2</sup> [373 (ii) δ] The word גלל, preceded by כ, means “on account of,” “for the sake of.” Hence, “manifest be manifested” might be taken as “*for the sake of* its being manifested.” That would suggest another way of explaining the divergence discussed in 373 (i).

<sup>3</sup> [373 (ii) ε] (1) In favour of the view that an original גלה underlies the Synoptic divergence, it may be urged that this verb—which is twice reduplicated in O.T.—appears to have caused divergence elsewhere in N.T. (498d). Also, it is the word used in the (548) passage of Deut. xxix. 29, which contrasts things “secret” and things “revealed.” (2) But Delitzsch gives, for Mk.’s “come into manifestation,” יבא לנור, a combination of גלה and בא. The latter might easily be confused with באר “in the light.” Possibly the original was “shall be enlightened (יאר) and revealed,” and Mk. took the rare יאר for the familiar בא, “*shall come* to be revealed.” (3) The verb עלה (suggested in 373δ) is used of that which is not hidden from God but “comes up” to Him: but it is perhaps only once (Jer. xiv. 2) employed absolutely in this sense.

<sup>4</sup> [374a] Mk. iv. 30 “*Are we to liken?*” “*We are to liken* (fut.)” would be identical with the passive “*is like(ened)*,” the form in Lk. Mt. omits the question, having merely, “Another parable he set forth unto them.” The reason may be as follows. The word “liken” is often (and is probably here) the same as “to-speak-in-parables” (משל), or (if we may use such a word) “to-parable.” “To parable a parable” occurs more than once in Ezekiel; and Codex D has here, in



kingdom of God...? as to a grain of mustard seed which when it is sown on the land—being less than all the seeds that are on the land—and [*i.e.* then, or yet, or nevertheless] when it is sown, shooteth up (lit. goeth up), and becometh greater than all the herbs, and maketh great branches" (see 379) "so that there are able to lodge under its shadow the birds of heaven."

a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field: which at first (*μὲν*) is less than all the seeds, but afterwards (*δὲ*) when it groweth it is greater than the herbs and becometh a tree, so that there come the birds of heaven and lodge in its branches."

...? It is like to a grain of mustard seed which a man took and put in[to] his garden, and it grew and came to [be] (*ἐγένετο εἰς*) a tree, and the birds of heaven lodged in its branches."

(i) "as to"

In answer to the question "How are we to liken?" Mark might have written "To a grain," or "[It is] as a grain." He has blended the two together in "as to a grain." Later Evangelists corrected this by inserting "like."

(ii) Mark has both paraphrased and literalized

[375] Mark's use of "go up" for "grow" shews literalism, and so probably does "and" used for "yet." But the passive ("when it is sown") is much rarer in Hebrew than the active ("a man sowed"), in which point Matthew and Luke probably recur to the original.

Mk., "In what *parable* shall we *parable* it?" The original may have been "And he was (particip.) parabling a parable and he said." Now the participial prefix (-ו) in "parabling" is easily confused with the interrog. "what" (מה) or "who" (מי), as in Zeph. iii. 18, "burden," lit. "that-which-is-borne (נשאת)," LXX "who took (τίς ἔλαβε)?" Hence "he was *parabling*" might be taken as "what parable?" (or vice-versa). Further details must be reserved for a commentary on the Triple Tradition. †

[376] The words "which a man sowed" would be, in Hebrew, "which a man sowed *it*." This superfluous pronoun, in the sentence "which a man sowed *it* on land," only needed a single Greek letter (the change of  $\alpha\gamma\tau\omicron$  to  $\alpha\gamma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ) to become "on *his* land," which might be interpreted as (Mt.) "his field" or (Lk.) "his garden."

[377] The *locus classicus* about "sowing" in O.T. is a passage in Isaiah (xxviii. 25), where "cast abroad," "scatter," and "put in," are rendered by LXX "sow" (repeated twice). Now "put" is a more appropriate word here than "sow" to describe the depositing of a single mustard-seed (since the Greek "sow" often implies "scattering apart," as in the word "sporadic"). Mark, however, who shows many signs of a free translation, may have rendered the original Hebrew "put" by "sow." The Corrector substituted "put ( $\epsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon$ )." This was conflated with "sowed." But it happens that "put" is frequently interchanged (by Greek corruption) with "took ( $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ ):" and "took and sowed" makes better sense than "put and sowed." Hence Matthew adopts "took and sowed." Luke found the correction "put" associated with a variation "took," and conflated them into "took and put."<sup>1</sup>

(iii) (*Mk.*) "*goeth up*"

[378] Compare a passage in Ezekiel where "their leaf" is rendered by the Septuagint "their *going-up*."<sup>2</sup> Here Mark's "*goeth up*"—which would be as harsh to a Greek ear as "went up" for "came up," when applied to plants, to an English ear—was probably altered by a Greek corrector of Mark into "groweth up."

<sup>1</sup> [377a] Comp. Is. lvii. 11 "laid ( $\sigma\eta$ ) it,"  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$   $\mu\epsilon$  (prob. Gk. corruption of  $\epsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$ );  $\sigma\eta$ = $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  (3),  $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  (6),  $\epsilon\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  (18):  $\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  and  $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ , in various forms, are confused in 1 Sam. xiv. 42, 2 Sam. xx. 22, 2 K. xxiii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> [378a] Ezek xlvi. 12 "leaf ( $\pi\lambda\upsilon$ ),"  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ . Comp. Mk. iv. 5, 6  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$  . . .  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\delta\tau\epsilon$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$   $\delta$   $\eta\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$  (Mt. xiii. 5, 6 sim.), Lk. viii. 6  $\phi\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ , (133) where it was shewn that the application of "rise up" to "seed" probably caused a marginal suggestion, "on the rising of the sun."

The correction was adopted both by Matthew and Luke ; but it does not quite represent the original sense. The meaning of Mark is : " It *shoots up* [from the ground] and [afterwards] *becomes* greater than all the herbs." Matthew says, " when it *has grown up*, it is greater than the herbs." <sup>1</sup>

(iv) "*Less than . . . on the land*"

Why does Luke omit these words? And why does Matthew omit "on the land"? If recognized as words of our Lord, they would hardly have been omitted on the mere ground of superfluity.

[379] Not improbably the original of "less" was an Aramaic word used in Daniel, which means literally "land," and then "landward" in the sense of "*lower*," "*inferior*," and is rendered "*less*" and "*smaller*" by the Greek translators. If so, Matthew has preserved the original "less than all the seeds"; Mark has conflated "less than" with "on the land"; Luke has omitted "less than" and its context, as being a corrupt repetition of "on the land" or "in his garden." <sup>2</sup>

Mk. iv. 32.

(β) "and it becometh greater than all the herbs and maketh great branches, so that there are able to lodge under its shadow the birds of heaven."

Mt. xiii. 32.

"it is greater than the herbs, and becometh *a tree*, so that there come the birds of heaven and lodge in its branches."

Lk. xiii. 19.

"and it came to [be] (ἐγένετο εἰς) *a tree* and the birds of heaven lodged in its branches."

<sup>1</sup> "Becomes (γίγνεται)," "is (ἐστίν)."

<sup>2</sup> Dan. ii. 39 "inferior (κῑκῑ)," Theod. ἡττων, LXX ἐλάττων. Evangelists translating the Parable of the Mustard Seed, as representing the Kingdom of Christ, might naturally use a word employed in Daniel ii. 39 ("another kingdom inferior to thee") to describe the kingdoms that were to prepare the way for the Messianic Stone. Luke may have omitted "being less . . . on the land" from homoioteleuton. But there are probably few cases of this error in Luke.

[380] First, as to Mark's and Matthew's words, "greater than [all]<sup>1</sup> the herbs," are we to suppose that Luke omitted them simply because they could be left out without detriment to the sense? More probably there was some corruption, or suspicion of corruption. The Hebrew words "herb" and "green-bough" are similar enough to be easily confused.<sup>2</sup> And "become greater than" resembles "make great" or "multiply."<sup>3</sup> Hence "it becomes greater than the herbs" is easily confused with "it maketh great, or multiplieth, its boughs." But this, or nearly this, follows in Mark's next clause. Hence Luke might omit the "herb-clause," or some form of it, as part of a conflation.

Again, the Septuagint affords instances where "shady-branches" (R.V. "lotus trees") and "boughs" are rendered "trees" or "trunks."<sup>4</sup> On this analogy, the Corrector might say that the meaning was not "maketh great branches," but "maketh a great stem or trunk, like a tree": and this he might express by "becometh a tree"—a rendering adopted by Matthew and Luke.

The parallelism between (Mark) "under its shadow" and (Matthew and Luke) "in its branches" may be illustrated by an instance of the Greek rendering of "shadow" by "branches" in Job.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [380a] Scores of instances might be given where the LXX inserts or omits "all" contrary to the Hebrew. Probably it was not in the original Hebrew here, and was inserted for conformity to Greek idiom.

<sup>2</sup> "Herb (ירק)," "green-bough, or sucker (נק)."

<sup>3</sup> "Greater than" = Hebr. "great from." "From" often = מ, a letter easily dropped or confused.

<sup>4</sup> Job xl. 21, 22 "lotus-trees (סלמס)," (a) παντοδαπά δένδρα, (b) δένδρα μεγάλα: Ezek. xxxi. 12, 13 "his boughs (יפתח)," στελέχη (bis).

<sup>5</sup> Job xl. 22 "with their shadow (צל)," LXX "with branches (or, shoots)," σὺν ῥαδάμοις.



§ 26. (*Mk.*) "*they receive him*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*he went*"

Mk. iv. 36.

Mt. viii. 23.

Lk. viii. 22.

"and . . . they receive him . . . in the boat . . . , and other boats were with him."

"and when he *went into* a boat there followed him *his disciples*."

"and he himself *went into* [Codex D "*went up into*," SS "*went up and sat in*"] a boat, and *his disciples*."

[381] See *Clue* (244-5), where it is shewn that (a) the Corrector may have taken as non-causative ("went") a verb that our Mark took causatively ("cause to come," "bring," *i.e.* "receive"); (b) the same Hebrew original (a form of נָחַם) might be variously interpreted as "others" (*i.e.* other boats), or as "follow," or as "followers," *i.e.* disciples.

§ 27. *Jesus sleeping on "the cushion": Mt.-Lk. differ*

Mk. iv. 38.

Mt. viii. 25.

Lk. viii. 23, 24.

"And he was in the stern on the cushion sleeping, and they wake him."

"And he was sleeping and *they came-to [him]* and woke him."

"But as they were sailing he fell asleep . . . but *they came-to [him]* and woke him up."

[382] No one has satisfactorily explained what Mark means by "*the cushion*." The natural meaning (which the Greek word often has) is "rowing-cushion"; but that would surely be called "*a cushion*."<sup>1</sup> "According to the later Greek interpreters," says Dr. Swete, on this passage, "it was merely a wooden head-rest (Thpht. ξυλινὸν δὲ πάντως ἦν τοῦτο), possibly a stage, or platform; cf. *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 321)." But no instance of the word thus used has hitherto been alleged. The quotation from Theophylact might indicate a wooden cabin, or shelter.

<sup>1</sup> "Cushion." Προσκεφάλαιον, though etymologically a cushion for the head, is also (L. & S.) a "rowing-cushion."

(i) *The parallel in Jonah*

[383] An analysis of the context, if there were space for it, would shew that some of its expressions are probably derived from, or influenced by, the story of Jonah, who might naturally be regarded as a contrast to Jesus in this description. The prophetic account, when describing Jonah sleeping, uses a word unique in the Bible (R.V. "the ship"<sup>1</sup>), which literally means "decked," "covered": "He was gone down into the *innermost parts* (A.V. *sides*) of the-decked-(ship) [? covered place, or cabin]; and he lay and was fast asleep: and *there-drew-nigh-unto him* the ship-master and said unto him, 'What meanest thou, O sleeper?'"

## (ii) "The stern"

[384] The Hebrew word rendered "innermost parts" (lit. "thighs") in the passage just quoted from Jonah, is rendered by the Septuagint six times the "rear" or "hinder part," and might therefore naturally be rendered "stern," which Mark has here.<sup>2</sup>

## (iii) "The cushion"

[385] If Mark interpreted Jonah's "covered (place)" as a cabin for sleeping, he might naturally connect it with the phrase (used by Matthew and Luke) "a place to rest his head":<sup>3</sup> and this was exactly expressed by the Greek word translated "cushion" above, but etymologically meaning "for-the-head," or "head-rest." This use of the Greek word would be quite novel, and sure to be censured by cultivated readers. But it was natural in a primitive Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> Jon. i. 5 "the ship (הַסֵּפִינִי)," πλοίου: πλο = κοιλοσταθμῷ (1), ξυλόω (1), φατνύω (2).

<sup>2</sup> Jon. i. 5 "Innermost-parts-of (הַכְּתִיבִי)," κοίτην: the word = ὀπίσθιος (4), ὀπίσω (2).

<sup>3</sup> Mt. viii. 20, Lk. ix. 58, "the son of man hath not where to lay (κλίνει) his head."

(iv) (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*came-to-[him]*"

[386] This may possibly have been added by the Corrector to soften the abruptness of the appeal of the disciples. But the addition may come from Jonah ("there drew nigh unto him").<sup>1</sup>

§ 28. (*Mk.*) "*feared*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*marvelled*"

Mk. iv. 41.

Mt. viii. 27.

Lk. viii. 25.

[387] "And they  
feared a great fear."

"But the men *mar-  
velled*."

"But they feared  
and *marvelled*."

It has been shewn (*Clue*, 138) that "*marvel*" might be substituted for "*fear*," because the latter, in Greek, does not imply reverence, as it does in Hebrew. Matthew accepted this as a substitute for the reduplicated "*fear*," Luke as a substitute for half of the reduplication.

Mark's use of Hebraic reduplication, here and elsewhere, indicates adherence to a Hebrew original.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [386a] Jon. i. 6 "*and there drew nigh* (וַיִּקְרַב) to him." (i) This, if נ were dropped, might easily be taken as "*and they called* (וַיִּקְרָא) to him." (ii) The next word in Jonah is *Rab*, "Master." This would make, "And they called to him, Master." (iii) The next word is lit. "the rope-man" (הַחֹבֵל)—*i.e.* (collectively) the men that manage the ropes, the sailors. But a far more common meaning of the root is "agony," "destruction" (λυμαλνομαι (2), ἀπώλεια (1), καταφθίρω (2), ὀλέκω (1), διαφθίρω (6), διαφθορά (2)), so that it might easily be interpreted as meaning "ruin is upon us," or "we are perishing." (iv) The next words are "And he said to him, What is it to thee?" These—when following, "And they said unto him, Master, we perish"—might be taken to mean, "And one (*i.e.* they) said unto him, What carest thou?" *i.e.* "Thou carest not," which Mark has here.

The Hebrew "draw nigh (קָרַב)"—which is 38 times rendered by Mt.'s and Luke's word "*came-to* [him]"—may have been translated by Mt.-Lk. correctly, but may have been confused by Mark with קָרָא "*call*." Comp. Ps. lxxv. 1 "*thy name is near* (קָרַב)," LXX "*we will call on* (ἐπικαλεσόμεθα) *thy name*" (leg. קָרַב). Jonah's words about "the thighs of the decked [place]" may have been omitted by Mt. and Lk. as being unintelligible in Hebrew and erroneously rendered in Mark.

<sup>2</sup> [387a] For other instances of Mark alone adhering to Hebrew reduplication comp. Mk. iv. 12 (where Mt. and Lk. have it only in appearance), i. 26, iii. 28, v. 42.

§ 29. (*Mk.*) "*his garment*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*the border of his garment*"

<i>Mk.</i> v. 27.	<i>Mt.</i> ix. 20.	<i>Lk.</i> viii. 44.
"... touched his garment."	"... touched <i>the border - of</i> his garment."	"... touched <i>the border of</i> his garment."

[388] The correction may have been made simply for reverence: but it is also possible that the original may have been a word capable of meaning either "garment" or "border [of a garment]," and taken by the Corrector in the latter sense.<sup>1</sup>

§ 30. (*Mk.*) "*villages*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*cities and villages*"

<i>Mk.</i> vi. 6.	<i>Mt.</i> ix. 35.	<i>Lk.</i> xiii. 22.
"And he travelled round the villages round about (lit. in a circle)."	"And Jesus travelled round <i>all the cities and the villages</i> ."	"And he went through [the country] <i>by cities</i> [ <i>i.e.</i> city by city] <i>and villages</i> ."

[389] In the Old Testament a distinction is generally drawn between "city" and "village"; but sometimes, *e.g.* when a "city" is mentioned along with its surrounding "cities," the latter are called by the Septuagint "villages," *e.g.* Josh. x. 39, "all the *cities* thereof," LXX "villages" (LXX om. but A ins. "all") In Jer. xix. 15, "on this city, and *on all her cities*," the LXX conflates the latter part thus: "*on all her cities and on all her villages*." This doubt between "cities" and "villages" may, at least in part, explain why Mark (i. 38) speaks of "the adjacent *village-cities*" (D and SS, "villages and cities"), where the parallel Luke (iv. 43) has "the other cities."

<sup>1</sup> The word *ἄκρος* literally means "wing," and hence, "extremity," "border." It is translated by the LXX "covering," *συνκάλυμμα*, in Deut. xxii. 30, xxvii. 20: "garment," *ἀναβολή*, in Ezek. v. 3: "skirt," *κρασπέδου* in Zech. viii. 23. R.V. has "skirt" in all these instances.



[390] This double meaning of the word "city" might easily cause ambiguity when the Hebrew Evangelist wrote that Jesus "went-round *city and city*"—that is to say, "city by city," or "all the cities in turn"<sup>1</sup>—"round about." Mark condensed "city and city" into "the cities," and then paraphrased it as "the villages," because he understood them to be the small cities "round about" the central city.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [390a] Comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 15 "the porters were *at every gate*," but LXX, literally, "gate *and* gate," where the parall. 1 Esdr. i. 15 has "at *each* gate": Ezr. x. 14 (LXX) "the elders of *city and city*" = 1 Esdr. ix. 13 "the elders of *each* place."

<sup>2</sup> [390b] Strictly speaking, *τάς* should have been inserted in Mk. before *κύκλω*. But this is not necessary: comp. 1 Chr. vi. 55 *καὶ τὰ περισπόρια αὐτῆς κύκλω αὐτῆς* (rep. in Josh. xxi. 11 where A has *τὰ κύκλω*), 2 Chr. xiv. 14 *τὰς κώμας αὐτῶν κύκλω* Γεδώρ, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 6 *τοῖς τόποις αὐτῶν κύκλω*. In Josh. xix. 8 "all the villages that were round about these cities," 2 Chr. xvii. 10 "all the kingdoms of the lands that were round about Judah," the Heb. has the relative, and A ins. the article before *κύκλω*, but the LXX omits it.

[390c] There are various readings of some importance in the text of Mk.: L and some cursives have *τάς κύκλω κώμας*: SS and *a* omit *κύκλω*: *d* has, "et circuibat castella et circumibat docens": Diatess. Arab. "and he went about in the villages which [were] *around Nazareth*."

The regular Heb. for "to travel round" is סָבַב. In rendering this "went through [the country]," Lk. may have had in his mind one of the very few descriptions of missionary circuits in O.T., 2 Chr. xvii. 9 "And they taught in Judah having the book of the Law of the Lord with them: and they *went about* (יִסְבּוּ) [more usually "compassed," "went round," etc. LXX here alone διήλθον "went through [the country]"] "in (בְּ-) all the cities of Judah." But the missionaries there described appear to have gone from, and returned to, Jerusalem, so that they might well be said to have gone *a* "circuit." That is not the case in Lk., for he adds at the end of xiii. 22 "teaching and *journeying on to Jerusalem*," and there is every reason to suppose that Lk. does not regard Jesus as having started from Jerusalem.

[390d] These passages have an important bearing on Rom. xv. 19 "from Jerusalem *and round about* (καὶ κύκλω) even to Illyricum." Some interpret this "circuitously," *i.e.* not journeying in a straight line, but deviating to many places on the way: and in favour of this view it is urged (Rom. ed. Sanday and Headlam ad loc.) that "κύκλω in the instances quoted of it in this sense (Gen. xxxv. 5, xli. 48) seems invariably to have the article." This, however, has been shewn above (390b) not to be the case. The Editors also quote, as favouring their view, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 1. 14 "and whether they must go through (διὰ) the holy mountain or *circuitously* (κύκλω) through the midst of Thrace." But there κύκλω means "making a circuit round" the mountain previously mentioned, so that, by analogy, κύκλω in Rom. should mean "making a circuit round Jerusalem." Moreover the Editors fail to explain why St. Paul inserts the needless "and" ("and round about").

Matthew and Luke agreed in taking "city and city" as "city and village," *i.e.* "cities and villages in turn." Matthew dropped "round about," because he applied it to the *journey*, not to the "*cities*," regarding it as implied in "travelled round." Luke—who also applied "round about" to the journey—expressed it in the verb "went [right] through (*διεπορεύετο*)," and he retained a touch ("by") of the distributive idiom in the Hebrew original.

§ 30 (i). *The positive instructions to the Twelve*

Mk. vi. 7-13.

Mt. x. 1-14.

Lk. ix. 1-6.

[390 (i)] "... he began (*ἤρξατο*) to send them . . . he began-to-give them authority - over the unclean spirits . . . going - forth (*ἐκπορεύόμενοι*) thence shake-out the dust (*χοῦν*) that is underneath your feet<sup>2</sup> . . .

" . . . he gave (535a) them authority - over unclean spirits so as to cast them out *and to-cure all (?) disease*<sup>1</sup> and *all (?) weakness*. These twelve Jesus sent (535a). . . . Proclaim saying that There - hath - drawn -

" . . . he gave (535a) them power and authority over (*ἐπὶ*) all (?) the devils *and to-cure diseases*.<sup>1</sup> And he sent (535a) them to *proclaim the kingdom* of God and to heal . . . , coming-forth (*ἐξερχόμενοι*) from *that city*, shake-

<sup>1</sup> It was indicated in *Clue* (243) that Mk.'s extraordinary omission of any precept about "preaching" or "proclaiming" might be explained by the frequent confusion between the Hebrew indicative, *e.g.* "they proclaimed," and imperative "proclaim ye"—the former of which is contained in Mk. vi. 12. The same might apply to "curing." If Mt.-Lk.'s "to cure" is parallel to Mk. vi. 13 "they-began-to-cure," this is not an agreement against Mk. in respect of the verb, but only in respect of the form of the verb.

"All" is queried as to the italicizing because, though Mt.-Lk. agree in attributing universality to the curing, they do not attach the adjective to the same noun. "All" is repeatedly inserted and omitted by the LXX, contrary to the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup> [390 (i) a] Comp. Lk. x. 11 "The dirt that has cleaved to-us from your city to (*εἰς*) our feet *we wipe off* (*ἀπομασσωμεθα*) against-you (lit. "for-you"), and Acts xiii. 51 "having shaken-out the dirt of their feet against them (*ἐπ' αὐτούς*)."  
Greek corruption might convert "we shake off," *ἀποτιᾶσσομεθα* to "we wipe off," *ἀπομασσωμεθα*. Comp. Judg. xvi. 20 *ἐκτιναχθήσομαι* (A, *ἀποτινάξομαι*), Neh. iv. 16 *ἐκτεταναγμένων* (A, B, *ἐκτεταγμένων*), ib. v. 15 *ἐκτετιναγμένοι* (B\* *ἐκτεταγμένοι*). In 2 S. xxii. 33, Neh. v. 13 *ἐκτείνω* is a v.r. for *ἐκτινάσσω*.

they-proclaimed that	nigh <i>the kingdom of</i>	off even the <i>dirt</i>
[they, <i>i.e.</i> people]	the heavens . . . cast	( <i>κοινοπτόν</i> ) from
should-repent, and	out <i>devils</i> . . . <i>coming-</i>	( <i>ἀπό</i> ) your feet . . .
they-began - to - cast-	forth ( <i>ἐξερχόμενοι</i> )	they - came - through
out many devils and	outside that house	[the land] . . . curing
they-began-to-anoint	or <i>that city</i> shake-out	everywhere."
with - oil many (lit.)	the <i>dirt</i> ( <i>κοινοπτόν</i> )	
invalids <sup>1</sup> and they	of your feet."	
began - to - cure		
[them]."		

We shall here depart from Mark's order a little, in order to consider under one head the positive precepts to the Twelve. The next section will consider the negative precepts.

(a) "*unclean spirits*," or "*devils*"

[390 (i) (a)] Jewish tradition distinguished "evil spirits," which caused melancholy and disease, from "unclean spirits," which were supposed to have a special connection with necromancy and witchcraft.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps it is for this reason that Matthew very rarely uses the latter phrase—only here and in the words of Jesus, recorded also by Luke, but not by Mark, "When the *unclean spirit* goeth out of the man."<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, Mark uses it very frequently indeed. Luke—apart from the passage just quoted from the Double Tradition—uses it only in those parts of the Gospel where he follows Mark, and in those parts of the Acts where he is describing the works of Peter, or Philip (but not of Paul). Here Luke deviates widely from Mark and avoids this term altogether.

<sup>1</sup> "Invalids" = ἀρρώστους, "disease," in Mt.-Lk., = νόσον. See below (390 (i) β).

<sup>2</sup> Hor. Hebr., on Lk. xiii. 11.

<sup>3</sup> [390 (i) (a) α] Mt. xii. 43 (Lk. xi. 24), referring to the spirit of idolatry that possessed Israel in ancient times. Hor. Hebr., on Mt. x. 2, connects "unclean spirits" with false prophets, referring to Rev. xvi. 13, 14, and Zech. xiii. 2 ("I will cut off the names of the idols . . . , and I will cause the prophets and the *unclean spirit* to pass out of the land").



Hence arises an apparent agreement of Matthew and Luke so far as this, that Matthew attributes to Jesus the words "cast out *devils*," while Luke has "gave authority over *devils*." But it is perhaps a mere coincidence. This is all the more probable because, as has been indicated above (243), Mark's "*they-began-to-cast-out . . . devils*" may be a mistranslation of an imperative (or *vice versa*).

(β) (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*disease(s)*"

[390 (i) (β)] The Greek word here rendered "disease," though very common in classical Greek, *never occurs in LXX except to mean disease inflicted by God as punishment*. "Invalid," in LXX, when referring to sickness, implies sickness *not* thus inflicted.<sup>1</sup> The latter was connected by the Stoics in the first century with moral infirmity.<sup>2</sup> Both Greek words occur in LXX as renderings of the same Hebrew word. It is quite intelligible that a Corrector, finding in Mark a word that might mean "infirm of mind," or "infirm of body," substituted the word used in regular Greek, "disease," as a better rendering of the Hebrew.

(γ) (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*proclaim the kingdom*"

[390 (i) (γ)] Mark contains no precept to proclaim the Gospel. But [242-3] the words "and they proclaimed" may be a misinterpretation of an original "proclaim [ye]" or "that they should proclaim." If that is the fact, Matthew's and Luke's agreement against Mark is limited to the object of the verb "proclaim." Here a correction was highly natural. For, since the Apostles were sent to preach *the Gospel*, or "*good-news*," it might seem to some a paradoxical way of expressing this to say that they were sent to preach "that men should *repent*."

<sup>1</sup> See LXX Concord. Νόσος and ἀρρωστος (-ια, -ημα) both = forms of νόη. "Invalid" represents only one side of ἀρρωστος; it sometimes means "disabled by accident."

<sup>2</sup> See L. and S.



Possibly, there was, originally, no object of "proclaim" (350), and it was variously added.<sup>1</sup> Or the original may have been obscure, *e.g.* "proclaimed that they [*i.e.* men] should draw near to God, or, to the kingdom of heaven." This was paraphrased by Mark as "proclaimed that men should repent." Matthew took it as meaning "Proclaim that there hath drawn near the kingdom of God."<sup>2</sup> Luke, in the Mission of the Twelve, has "to proclaim the kingdom of God": but in the Mission of the Seventy, he adopts the same version as Matthew's, only in quite a different context, representing the Seventy as saying to the unbelieving city from which they are departing, "Notwithstanding, know this, that there hath drawn near the kingdom of God."<sup>3</sup>

(δ) (Mk.) "going-forth thence," (Mt.-Lk.) "coming-forth . . . city"<sup>4</sup>

[390 (i) (δ)] Mark uses "go forth" again ("and when it was evening they used to go-forth outside the city (Jerusalem)") where Matthew and Luke have "come-forth"—a more appropriate word to describe the mere act of "coming out" from a city as distinct from "going forth" on a journey.<sup>5</sup> Here perhaps Mark meant "go forth on a new journey," in which case the word would be very suitable: but the Corrector, taking it to mean merely "coming out," might substitute the latter word here as he did later on in connection with Jerusalem.

The addition of "outside (or, from) that city" (Matthew adds also "that house") is one of a very large class of corrections (534 (i)) intended to add definiteness to Mark.

<sup>1</sup> In that case, the correction here would resemble one in an earlier passage of Mk. (i. 38, see 350).

<sup>2</sup> The complete discussion of this passage would require a preliminary discussion of the variations, in words and order, between Mk. i. 14, 15 and Mt. iv. 17 (Lk. diff.).

<sup>3</sup> Lk. x. 11.

<sup>4</sup> "Go-forth" = ἐκπορεύεσθαι: "come-forth" = ἐξέρχεσθαι.

<sup>5</sup> Mk. xi. 19, Mt. xxi. 17, Lk. xxi. 37.

(ε) (*Mk.*) "*dust*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*dirt*"

[390 (i) (ε)] "The dust of thy feet" occurs in Isaiah and in Nahum, meaning, in the former possibly, and in the latter certainly, *the ground on which a person walks*. In the former passage the LXX has "dust"; in the latter (lit.), "dirt."<sup>1</sup> The dust of a foreign land was held by Jewish tradition to defile things to which it adhered: but Wetstein, *Horae Hebraicae*, and Schöttgen say nothing that justifies Alford (without alleging authority) in asserting: "It was a custom of the Pharisees, when they entered Judaea from a Gentile land, to do this act."<sup>2</sup> Moreover the curious variations—"shake-out," "shake-off" (and, in the Mission of the Seventy, "wipe off"), together with "dust *that is underneath*," "dirt *of*," "dirt *from*" (and, in the Mission of the Seventy, "dirt *that has cleaved to us from your city to our feet*")—indicate some original Hebrew obscurity resulting in Greek divergence and requiring investigation.

Chrysostom's comment on Matthew's statement is, "[The object was] either to show that they (*i.e.* the apostles) had received nothing from them (*i.e.* from the unbelievers), or to testify against them concerning the long journey they had taken [to come] to them." This proves that he was in doubt about its meaning. Wetstein quotes a Jewish tradition that a certain Rabbi "when he had gone down to Babylon, took *dust* from [the place] in a napkin and *shook it forth* abroad to confirm what is said in Exodus, 'and the Lord *shook-out*

<sup>1</sup> Is. xlix. 23 "shall lick the *dust* (χούη) of thy feet." We could not use "dirt" in English in Nah. i. 3 "the clouds are the *dust* (κονιοπρός) of his feet," *i.e.* of the feet of God, apparently meaning that He walks upon the clouds as men walk on the dust of the earth.

In classical Greek χούη means "earth (piled up)," but in LXX, it frequently means "dust," "fine powder," etc. Also, in classical Greek, κονιοπρός mostly means "a cloud of dust," but it also = metaph. (L. and S.) "a dirty fellow." It seems to be used of "mire" that "sticks" to the shoes and has to be "wiped off" in Lk. x. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Alford on Mt. x. 14.

the Egyptians in the Red Sea.'"<sup>1</sup> This is illustrated by the action of Nehemiah invoking God's judgment as follows, (R.V.) "I *shook-out* my lap, and said, So God *shake-out* every man from his house and from his labour that performeth not this promise."<sup>2</sup> From the former passage, as illustrated by the latter, it would appear that "taking up the dust" of a place and "shaking it *out*" was a Jewish symbol of denunciation, threatening the inhabitants of the place with destruction from heaven. This suits very well with the subsequent words in Matthew (and in Luke's Mission of the Seventy) "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom . . . than for that city." Whether this was the original meaning or not, must be discussed in a later treatise. The present object is merely to show that the original may have been reasonably supposed to have this meaning of *denunciation* as well as the meaning, usually assumed, of *renunciation*, and that this divergence of interpretation caused Matthew and Luke to deviate from Mark.

§ 30 (ii). *The negative instructions to the Twelve*

Mk. vi. 8.

Mt. x. 9, 10.

Lk. ix. 3.

" . . . that they      "Do not obtain      "Take nothing  
should take for[their] gold, nor-yet (μὴδέ) for the journey,

<sup>1</sup> Wetst. on Mt. x. 14. Ex. xiv. 27 R.V. "overthrew (וָפַק)" (marg. "*Heb. shook-off*") ἐξερύαξεν, i.e. "*shook-out*."

<sup>2</sup> Neh. v. 13 וָפַק, ἐκτινάξαι. Comp. Job xxxviii. 12, 13 "Hast thou . . . caused the day-spring to know its place, that it might take hold of the ends of the earth and the wicked be *shaken-out* of it?" That this is the regular word for "rejection and destruction" appears also in Ps. cxxxvi. 15 "But *shook-out* Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea" (R.V. txt. "overthrew," marg. "*Heb. shook-off*"), evidently alluding to Ex. xiv. 27. In the Acts, the only city thus denounced is Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 51). Did any calamity befall this city? The Sibylline oracles mention "miserable Antioch" twice in connection with earthquake. But that Antioch is not in Pisidia, and the date is A.D. 115 (*Orac. Sibyll.* iv. 140, xj. (xiii.) 125).



journey nothing ex-	<i>silver</i> , <sup>1</sup> nor-yet brass	<i>neither</i> (μήτε) staff. . .
cept a staff alone, not	for your girdles . . .	nor (μήτε) bread, nor
bread . . . (lit.) not for	<i>nor-yet</i> a staff."	<i>silver-money</i> ." <sup>1</sup>
the girdle ( <i>i.e.</i> pocket)		
brass-money."		

(α) (Mk.) "*except a staff alone*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*nor-yet* (Lk. *neither*) *a staff*"

[390 (ii) (α)] See *Clue* (264-7). The original precept seems to have bidden the disciples take "nothing *except* (ΙΜΗ) the staff of bread"—probably meant in a spiritual sense, the "daily bread" that comes from the Father—altered by Greek corruption into "nothing, *not* (ΜΗ) staff, bread" and then into "nothing, *not* staff, *not* bread."

(β) (Mk.) "*brass-money*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*silver*" or "*silver-money*"

[390 (ii) (β)] An ancient Greek grammarian says that ignorant and common people used the word "brass" of money in general.<sup>2</sup> So it is used with us in some parts of England. But we should not like to have the word thus used in our English Bible, and it is reasonable to suppose that correctors and editors of Mark, if they took the word in that sense, would alter it. But Matthew and Luke have adopted quite different corrections.

Matthew, retaining brass, inserts "gold" and "silver," so as to indicate that the word is not used in the vulgar meaning, but as a climax in the literal sense, "no gold, no, nor yet silver, no, nor even *brass*." Luke substitutes the

<sup>1</sup> "Silver" = ἀργυρος. "Silver-money" = ἀργύριον (lit. "a silverling," hence "silver money" and then "money" in general). "Ἀργυρος is more appropriate to metal than to money, and would not often be used of money except to distinguish silver money from gold.

<sup>2</sup> Wetst. on Mk. vi. 8 quotes Pollux ix. 92 ἡ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἰδιωτῶν χρῆσις τὸν χαλκὸν ἀργύριον λέγει (*i.e.* uses the word brass to mean silver-money). Pollux quotes "He has no brass" and "I owe brass." Hesychius says that the word is used to mean gold and silver money.



ordinary Greek word "silver-money." These corrections may be independent of any one corrector of Mark, and Matthew's and Luke's agreement in this single word is probably a mere coincidence, arising from the fact that both are speaking of money.

(γ) *The Hebrew original of (Mk.) "brass-money"*

[390 (ii) (γ)] The ordinary Hebrew word for "money" means "silver": but if this was in the original, Mark would hardly have rendered it by anything but "silver," since that was consistent with ordinary Greek as well as Hebrew usage. It seems likely, then, that Jesus used some special word, and probably a metaphorical one, speaking contemptuously of money, and perhaps with a play on the term. "Dross" would answer the purpose. But "brass"—since it might actually be applied to money, and since it had Hebrew associations with worthlessness—would be much better.<sup>1</sup>

There is no evidence that Jewish traditions used "brass" for money as it was used in Greek slang, or Greek dialect.<sup>2</sup> But it is quite conceivable that Jesus, when protesting against covetousness, and playing on the Biblical associations of the word "brass," Nachash, or "serpent," may have frequently used this term metaphorically to signify "*the deceitfulness of wealth*."<sup>3</sup> Some explanation of this kind may account for the following divergence:

<sup>1</sup> "Brass (נְרָנ)" = "fetters" frequently; it = (metaph.) worthless people in Jer. vi. 28, Ezek. xxii. 18. In Ezek. xvi. 36 it is prob. (see Gesen. Oxf. נְרָנ, where read Ez. for Ex.) "filthiness," but LXX "brass."

<sup>2</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Mk. xii. 41 quotes "The School of Hillel saith, *into a shekel of silver and a shekel of brass*," and again, "He that changeth a *selaa* and receives for it *brass money*, that is, *prutahs*." In these instances the word is used literally as we should speak of "copper money," or "change in copper." Hor. Hebr. quotes no instance of Hebrew usage corresponding to the Greek vernacular "*brass*" employed for money in general.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Ezek. xvi. 36 "filthiness (נְרָנ)" LXX "brass," with Mk. iv. 19 "*the deceitfulness of riches and the lusts about the rest*," Lk. viii. 14 "riches and

Mk. xii. 41.

"He was observing how the multitude (lit.) casts *brass* into the treasury and many rich men were casting many [things]."

Lk. xxi. 1.

"He saw those casting into the treasury their *gifts* — the rich."

[390 (ii) (δ)] Here the sense and the context indicate that the money could not have been literally "brass." For Jesus goes on to contrast the poor widow who casts in two mites with *all the others*; "for they were *all* casting out of *their superabundance*." This, though not perhaps incompatible, is certainly incongruous, with the notion that there was a "multitude," presumably consisting in large measure of poor people, giving what we should call "money in coppers." But if the original term was "brass"—sometimes used, even in narrative, by the earliest Evangelists, in accordance with Christ's own words, to characterize the base gifts of the rich, who gave to God what cost them practically nothing—then the divergence can be explained. For in that case the original was, nearly as Luke, "men-casting into the treasury brass [for so the Lord called it]—rich-folk." Luke simply altered "brass" into "their gifts" (as he altered it into "money" in the Mission of the Twelve).

But editors of Mark xii. 41, taking "brass" to mean, literally, "small change," and considering that this must describe the gifts of "the many," inserted in the margin "many," meaning "multitude," instead of "men." But "many" might also mean "many (things)," or might be applied to "the rich (folk)." Hence might spring the following conflated result:—" [*Many i.e.*] the multitude cast[ing] into the treasury brass, and *many* rich folk were casting *many-things*."

[390 (ii) (ε)] It may be observed in conclusion that if *the pleasures of life*," Mt. xiii. 22 simply "the *deceitfulness* of riches," where Mk. may have, in effect, conflated "deceitfulness" and "filthiness," or may have paraphrased more fully.

Christ's precept to the Apostles was "no brass [be] in your girdles, or purses," and if it meant, metaphorically, "deal in nothing but sterling gold," this would harmonize very well with other early Christian doctrine. For Christ taught His disciples to provide treasure that would not "rust":<sup>1</sup> and the Apocalypse represents Him as saying "Buy of me *gold* refined by fire"<sup>2</sup>—it being the peculiarity of gold not to *rust*.<sup>3</sup> Now the son of Sirach likens the wickedness of a false foe to the "rust" of brass.<sup>4</sup> James, too, warns the covetous that their gold is "rusted" (that is to say, that it is proved to be false metal, mere *brass*), and that the "rust" or "venom"—for the same Greek word means both—will "eat their flesh" (perhaps a play on the "venom" of the "serpent" and the "rust" of "brass").<sup>5</sup> All these passages are in favour of giving Mark's precept a metaphorical meaning, and in favour of taking "brass" to mean "dross" or "false coin," or "treasure that rusts."<sup>6</sup>

This view will be confirmed if it can be shown hereafter that the other precepts in Mark's Mission of the Twelve are metaphorical.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mt. vi. 19, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. iii. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Philo i. 503.

<sup>4</sup> Sir. xii. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Jas. v. 3, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Hence, to have brass for one's girdle would suggest being "girt with falsehood." On the other side, gold is the symbol of truth, and Jesus is (Rev. i. 13), "girt . . . with a *golden* girdle." Comp. Ephes. vi. 14 "having girded your loins with *truth*." There is some doubt about the precise meaning of the extra-canonical saying, assigned to Jesus by many good authorities, "Be sterling (δολιμοί) exchangers": but it at all events harmonizes with the tendency of the passages above quoted. It is possible that having "brass" in one's girdle may have also included the notion of being *encumbered* with "the sin that doth so easily beset us."

<sup>7</sup> [390 (ii) (ε) a] This must be reserved for a Synoptic commentary. But the interpretation can be suggested here.

(1) "*Sandals*." Mk. says "*But* shod with *sandals*," Mt. "do *not* obtain . . . *shoes*," Lk. om. (but Lk. x. 4, Mission of the Seventy, "*not shoes*").

In Greek literature, "sandal" (Hesych., and see Index to Lucian) means a woman's shoe (or, very rarely indeed, a man's bedroom slipper, Theocr. xxiv. 36 "rise up [from bed], Amphitryon . . . not even putting on your *slippers*"). In New Hebrew the Greek word was transliterated (סנדל) to represent something quite different from סנעל (Bibl. Hebr. mostly נעל) "shoe," or "boot." The



§ 31. (*Mt.-Lk.*) *Herod "the tetrarch," Mk. differs*

Mk. vi. 14, 20.

Mt. xiv. 1.

Lk. ix. 7.

"And King Herod heard [it], for his name had - become known . . . and he kept him safe,<sup>1</sup> and having heard him he was much perplexed<sup>2</sup> and he heard him gladly."

"Herod *the tetrarch* heard the report of Jesus."

"But Herod *the tetrarch* heard all that was coming to pass and was sore perplexed."

Hebrew "sandal" was of harder leather than the "shoe" (Hor. Hebr. on Mt. x. 10); its sole was sometimes of wood, and it was "open both ways so that one might put in his foot either before or behind." Wetstein (on Mt. x. 10) quotes Bava Bathra, f. 58. 1 "Sandals in summer, (סנעליס) shoes in winter"; but R. Sam. ben Meir (Levy, *Neuhebraisch-Wörterbuch*, סנדל) explained this as meaning that the "sandal" was to be *under the bed and out of the way* in summer, *when not used*, and the shoe in winter. Apparently the Jewish "sandal" might be either a clog or a light shoe. In any case the Jews drew a marked distinction between the "boot or shoe (ὀπόδημα, סנדל)" and the "sandal (סנדל)": "The pulling off of *the shoe* [of the husband's brother," Deut. xxv. 9] is right: and of *the sandal*, if it hath a heel, is right; but if not, it is not right" (Hor. Hebr. on Mt. x. 10).

The LXX gives practically no assistance as to the meaning of σανδάλιον. It renders סנדל (Tromm.) (21) ὀπόδημα (1) σανδάλιον, the latter occurring in Is. xx. 2, where possibly the LXX meant that the prophet was to wear nothing on his feet, *not even* "sandals." In Josh. ix. 5, it occurs in a conflation with ὀποδήματα to represent סנדל. In Judith x. 4, xvi. 9 mention is made of a woman's "sandals," according to Greek usage.

One suggested explanation of Mk.'s use of σανδάλια is that he "disliked the repetition of ὑποδεδεμένους ὑποδήματα." This is particularly futile in face of the fact that Mk. is that one of the Synoptists who least objects to such reduplications, and who is least affected by considerations of style. The best explanation is based on Eph. vi. 15 "Having *shod* your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace," and recognizing "sandals" as used in the Jewish sense to denote the *shoes of pilgrims*.

Wetstein (on Mk. vi. 9) quotes a Targum, "How beautiful are the feet of

<sup>1</sup> "Kept him safe" *συνετήρει*, A.V. "observed him." The word is used of obeying, or "observing," laws, commandments etc., but not of obeying persons.

<sup>2</sup> "He was much perplexed" *πολλὰ ἤπόρει*. D *ἐποίη* "did many things," and so SS (393b).



(i) "*The tetrarch*"

[391] Herod—though technically only a "tetrarch" (Hebr. "prince the fourth")—might, and probably would, be called "king" both by his subjects and by the Galilean Church, which would regard Herod as fulfilling the Psalmist's (Ps. ii. 2) prophecy that "the *kings* of the earth set themselves . . . against the Lord and against his Anointed (*i.e.* Christ)"; so that "king" would probably be the title used in the earliest Gospels. But the substitution of "tetrarch" would be very natural in later Gospels, partly to distinguish Herod the tetrarch from his father Herod the king, and partly to meet the objections of controversialists; who might justly say that the tetrarch not only was never king but also brought ruin on himself in the attempt to induce the Roman Emperor to make him king.<sup>1</sup>

Israelites going up to appear before God thrice in the year with *sandals of yew!*" This alludes to the prophecy of Isaiah ("How beautiful are the feet . . .") about those who were to "preach the Gospel of peace." The meaning is that the Evangelists were to be, metaphorically, *shod lightly*, or literally, free from encumbrance.

The word *σανδάλια* occurs in N.T., elsewhere, only in Acts xii. 8, one among several of Mk.'s words (like *κράβαττος*) rejected by Lk. in the Gospel but retained by him in the Petrine portions of the Acts. The narrative of Peter's release describes a probably historical fact in symbolical language, and the use of *σανδάλια* there is one of many symbolical features.

(2) "*Two tunics*." Mk. says, "Do not *put on* two tunics." Mt. omits "put-on," Lk. substitutes "have." The richer classes wore (Lk. iii. 11) "two tunics." Perhaps Jesus meant, "Do not affect the manners of the rich." But comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 5. 7, describing the detection of a letter in a man's inner tunic, "for he had *put on*," says Josephus, "*two tunics*." Hor. Hebr. on Mt. x. 9 says, "that which in the Mishna is *his purse* (תרמיל), in the Gemara אשנרתו, which was an *inner garment*, with pockets to hold money and necessities." Lk., in the Mission of the Seventy, omits "*two tunics*" but inserts (Lk. x. 4) "*purse*," perhaps as being implied in the inner of the "two tunics." This, then, is a precept that might be taken literally. But probably the disciples of Jesus never wore "two tunics," and had no need to be cautioned against the habit; and the caution was intended to warn them against encumbrances of all kinds.

<sup>1</sup> Possibly, but not probably, there may have been confusion of Hebrew. In Josh. xv. 7, the word "fourth"—required here to make up "tetrarch"—is substituted by the Septuagint for the name "Debir," the letters of which regularly

(ii) "*perplexed*," etc.

[392] The omission of almost all these details by Matthew and Luke is probably to be explained by their being conflation—arising from the similarity between the Hebrew words "hear," "observe" (or, "keep"), and "am perplexed"—based upon one of two originals, either "Herod heard his hearing (*i.e.* his report, or fame)," or "Herod was perplexed with perplexity" *i.e.* was sore perplexed.<sup>1</sup>

Luke, who omits the whole account of the dancing of the daughter of Herodias, nevertheless adopts this one tradition—"the sore perplexity" of Herod. But he refers it, not to the period during the Baptist's life, but after his death. He, too, like Mark, connects it with "Herod heard"—but in a different way. Mark connects the "perplexity" with Herod "hearing" the *preaching* of the Baptist, Luke with Herod "hearing" *rumours that the Baptist had risen from the dead*.<sup>2</sup>

[393] As for Mark's statement that Herod "heard John gladly," it may be either a free rendering of the Hebrew "hearing he heard [about] him" (which Mark may have wrongly interpreted "he heard with all his heart"); or "hear" may be confused with "rejoice," as it is on one

mean "word," "speech," "utterance," "report." Now the phrase "for the word of" is regularly used for "because of." Hence the original of Mark might be: "And there heard [it] Herod the prince *for the word of* [*i.e.* because of] his fame." If this was the original, Mark has freely paraphrased it in "for his fame had become known": Matthew and Luke have taken "the prince *for the word of*" as "the prince *of the fourth part*," *i.e.* the Tetrarch: and there was certainly more inducement for them to do this than for the Septuagint in Joshua. Delitzsch renders, "tetrarch," שר־הָרִבֵּעַ Josh. xv. 7 "Debir (רִבְרָה)" = τὸ τέρταρον (leg. רִבְעִיה). The phrase "for the word of (עֲלֵרְבָה)" (Chald.) = ἕνεκεν (1); עֲלֵרְבָר = ἕνεκεν (6), ὅτι (2), περὶ (3).

<sup>1</sup> [392a] "Hear" = (a) שָׁמַע; "keep" = (b) שָׁמַר; "am perplexed" = (c) שָׁמַם; (a) and (b) are prob. confused in Is. lix. 16, xliii. 12 (comp. Mk. x. 22 στυγαίνας = Mt. xix. 22, Lk. xviii. 23 ἀκούσας): (b) and (c) are confused in Exod. xxi. 29, 36, Mic. vi. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Lk. ix. 7 ἤκουσεν δὲ . . . καὶ διηπόρει, where Mk. vi. 14 has simply καὶ ἤκουσεν.

occasion in two parallel Hebrew passages.<sup>1</sup> Even the various reading in Mark (D and SS), "he did many things" (instead of "he was much perplexed"), may perhaps be explained by Hebrew corruption. It is true that the words are very similar in Greek: but we also find "hear" translated once by "do" in the Septuagint.<sup>2</sup>

§ 32. (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*withdrawing*" or "*drawing back*"; *Mk. differs*

Mk. vi. 29-32.

[*After the Baptist's death*]

"And when his [John's] disciples heard [of his death] they came and took up his corpse and put it in a tomb. And the Apostles gathered together unto Jesus and brought him word of all that they had done and all that they had taught. And he saith unto them, Come ye (emph.) yourselves apart to a desert place and rest awhile . . . and they went away in the boat to a desert place apart."

Mt. xiv. 12-13.

[*After the Baptist's death*]

"And his [John's] disciples came to [him] and took up the corpse and buried him, and came and brought word to Jesus, but when Jesus heard it he *withdrew* thence in a boat to a desert place apart."

Lk. ix. 10.

[*After Luke's account of Herod's perplexity concerning Jesus*]

"And the Apostles returned and related to him all that they had done. And he took them with him and *drew-back* apart to a city called Bethsaida."

<sup>1</sup> [393a] 2 K. xx. 13 "hearkened (ἤκουσεν)," LXX "rejoiced" = Is. xxxix. 2 "was glad (ἠγάπησεν)," and so Exod. iv. 31 "heard," LXX "rejoiced." The Gk. "gladly (ἡδέως)" occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in 2 Cor. xi. 19, and Mk. xiii. 37 "the common people heard him *gladly*" (a clause rejected by Mt.-Lk.) where "gladly" is probably a conflation of "hear."

<sup>2</sup> [393b] 1 K. viii. 30 "When thou *hearest* (ἤκουσεν)," ποιεῖς (? leg. ποιεῖ). The parallel 2 Chr. vi. 21 is rightly translated by LXX. In Mk. vi. 20, D reads ποιεῖ for ἤκουει: SS "And many things that he heard from him *he did*."



The verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke, though it consists in no more than a portion of a word ("draw"), is not the result of accident, and it affords an insight into the obscurities of the original Hebrew Gospel.

(i) *Who "brought word"? And what "word"?*

[394] Mark and Luke say that "the *Apostles*," Matthew that *the Baptist's disciples*, "bring word" to Jesus. According to Matthew, the "word" was about the Baptist's death; according to Mark and Luke, about the "doings and teachings" of "the Apostles"—or rather (according to Luke) not teachings, but "doings" only.

This indicates obscurity in the early text. There can have been no subject, in the original Hebrew, except "they." Who "they" were had to be determined from the context. But if the sentence came at the beginning of a detached tradition—the story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand—"they" could not be defined with certainty, and Evangelists would vary in defining it. There is no obscurity *now* in Mark; for he *now* mentions, definitely, "apostles." But it is a remarkable fact that he uses the term "apostles" (probably) nowhere else.<sup>1</sup> "Apostles" therefore is, very probably, a late insertion, not recognized by Matthew, though adopted by Luke.

[395 (i)] Also as regards the nature of the news, there is no obscurity *now* in Mark: "all that they had done and all that they had taught." But why does Luke reject "all that they had taught"? Probably because the original Hebrew contained either (like Matthew) no object of the verb, or, if there was an object, merely "all that *had been done*." This (whether a part of the Original, or a Hebrew addition) might be interpreted "all that *they, the messengers, had done*."

<sup>1</sup> [394a] "Apostles" is doubtful in Mk. iii. 14. Mk. mostly has "the disciples" or "the Twelve."



Mark and Luke interpreted it thus, *because they believed the messengers to be "the Apostles"*—Mark adding "all that they had taught," for definiteness, to explain that something more was meant than mere "doing," *i.e.* casting out devils, etc.<sup>1</sup> But Matthew *thought the messengers were the disciples of John the Baptist, returning from the burial of their Master.* He might therefore naturally infer that "all that had been done" (if it was in the Hebrew Original) referred to the circumstances of the Baptist's death; and from that point of view he might decide to omit the words because they raised a question as to the meaning, which would (he thought) be clearer without them.

(ii) "*Come ye, etc.,*" *why omitted by Matthew and Luke*

[395 (ii)] It is impossible to believe that Matthew and Luke recognized these beautiful words as Christ's, uttered at this point, and yet omitted them for the sake of brevity. The most probable explanation of their omission is that they regarded them as an evangelistic paraphrase intended to explain some obscure expression latent in the "withdrawing" or "drawing-back."

[396] Luke's word ("drew back") is almost non-occurrent in the Septuagint,<sup>2</sup> but it is used by Symmachus in the Psalmist's description of "the young lions" seeking their prey: "the sun ariseth, they *get-them-away*," where the Hebrew means "gather,"—a word used in many senses.<sup>3</sup> A man may be "gathered" to his fathers, *i.e.* die; or "gathered" into the congregation, after separation, *i.e.* be restored; or "gathered"

<sup>1</sup> [395 (i) a] See *Clue* (174-5) for an instance of variation arising from the Hebrew "that which had been done." For a similar amplification, or conflation see Mk. v. 19, Lk. viii. 39. There Lk. ("how great things God hath done for thee") has preserved the original; but Mk. conflates this with "and hath pitied thee."

<sup>2</sup> It occurs thrice, but does not represent a Hebrew word except in Sir. xiii. 9 "distant (רחוק) " *ὑποχωρῶν*.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. civ. 22 "they get them away (קצוּם)," *συνήχθησαν*.

to a refuge, *i.e.* flee; or "gathered" into a house, *i.e.* be hospitably entertained. The possibilities of mistranslation of the word are illustrated by the Psalm above quoted where the Revised Version has "get-them-away," but the Authorized and the Septuagint "gather themselves together." Again, where the Revised has "I will smite you . . . and *ye shall be gathered together* within your cities and I will send the pestilence among you," the sense would obviously be satisfied by "ye shall be *destroyed* within your cities for I will send . . ."; and the Septuagint has "ye shall *flee* into your cities."<sup>1</sup>

[397] From all this it follows that a Hebrew original, meaning that the Messiah "received," or "gathered," the depressed disciples, at the critical time when they were cast down by the death of the Baptist, might be mistranslated so as to mean that He "withdrew" to the desert. And, for Matthew at all events, there might be a prejudice in favour of the latter interpretation because he regarded it as the fulfilment of a special prophecy.<sup>2</sup> But on the other hand there were predictions that the Lord would "gather the outcasts of Israel"; and such an act was most appropriate at this point when the Evangelist is preparing the reader for the story of the feeding of the flock: for the feeding must be preceded by "gathering."<sup>3</sup> On the whole, Mark's

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xxvi. 25, A.V. inserts "when" so as to give "*when* ye are gathered . . . I will send."

<sup>2</sup> [397a] Mt. xii. 15-21 "And Jesus, perceiving it, *withdrew* (*ἀνεχώρησεν*) . . . that it might be fulfilled . . . 'He shall not strive, nor cry aloud, neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets . . .'" *Ἀναχωρεῖν* is never used by Luke, who here prefers *ὑποχωρεῖν*. Mk. iii. 7 uses it once, Jn. vi. 15 once (of Jesus "withdrawing," but Tisch. "fleeth (*φεύγει*)" from the attempt to make Him a king). Mt. uses it four times of Jesus. Aquila uses the word to mean rapid "flight (*נווד*)."<sup>3</sup> If frequently used, it might expose Christians to the objection that their Master was a constant fugitive—a charge brought by Celsus. Jn.'s special context avoids that danger.

<sup>3</sup> Is. xi. 12 (R.V.) "shall assemble the outcasts of Israel," *συνάξει τοὺς ἀπολωμένους Ἰσραὴλ*, comp. Mic. iv. 6 (R.V.) "I will *assemble* her that halteth," where the word means rather "hospitably entertain," as in Judg. xix. 18 (R.V.)

interpretation, regarded as a paraphrase, appears closer to the original than that of Matthew and Luke, though the latter were verbally correct in rejecting the words "come ye . . ."

### (iii) *The Original*

[398] This was probably extremely brief, and verbally far more like Luke than like Mark: "And they gathered to him and told him all that had been done. And he *gathered them* in a dry and desert place."<sup>1</sup> Luke interpreted this "took them with him and *drew back*." But, if Mark is true to the spirit of the tradition, it meant, "He gathered them" as a shepherd "gathers" stray sheep into the flock, or "gathers" the whole flock to give them water—thus implying the gift of safety, rest, and refreshment. In order to make it clear that the meaning was *causative*, "he *made* them rest," or "*caused* them to rest," an early editor of the Hebrew Gospel may have inserted the command in the margin and also the reason for it; adding, in effect: "He commanded them saying 'Come and rest, and take refreshment.'" Then, when "take refreshment" came to be interpreted as "eat," it became necessary to add *why* they had had no food.

[399] Matthew and Luke are right in rejecting all this as not a part of the original Gospel, and also as giving (if interpreted literally) a too materialistic preparation for the Feeding of the Five Thousand. But if we understand "Rest awhile" to mean spiritual rest, Mark's interpolation leads us to a true view of Christ's action at the critical

"no man *taketh* me into his house," where R.V. does not venture to give "assembles." So too in Ps. xxvii. 10 (R.V.) "the Lord will *take me up* (lit. gather me)," προσλάβετε.

<sup>1</sup> For the repetition of the verb, first applied to the flock and then to the shepherd, comp. Deut. xxx. 2, 3 "(when thou) shalt *return* unto the Lord thy God . . . then the Lord thy God will . . . *return* and gather thee . . ." For mention of "gathering" a flock for watering, or "gathering" stray sheep or oxen, see Gen. xxix. 3, Deut. xxii. 2.

For the parallelism between "the boat," "Bethesda," etc., see *Clue* (167-71).



moment of the Baptist's death. He came forward as the Shepherd of Israel "to *gather* the flock in a dry and desert place." His "withdrawal" was a mere detail. The essential fact was His "gathering."

§ 33. (Mk.) "*on foot*," (Mt.) "*followed on foot*,"  
(Lk.) "*followed*"

Mk. vi. 33.

Mt. xiv. 13.

Lk. ix. 11.

"... many, and on  
foot from all the cities  
they ran together  
there."

"the *multitudes*  
*followed him on foot*."

"the *multitudes* . . .  
*followed him*."

[400] See *Clue* (166), where it has been shewn that "on foot" is an error for "followed." Luke has preserved the right tradition. Mark has a wrong one. Matthew has conflated the two. "Multitudes" is another translation of the Hebrew "many."

§ 34. (Mk.) "*teach*," (Mt.) "*cured*," (Lk.) "*healed*"<sup>1</sup>

Mk. vi. 34.

Mt. xiv. 14 (a), ix. 36,  
xiv. 14 (b).

Lk. ix. 11.

"And he came  
forth and saw a great  
multitude, and he  
had compassion upon  
them because they  
were as sheep not  
having a shepherd,  
and he began to  
teach them many  
things."

"And he came  
forth and saw a great  
multitude, and he  
had compassion upon  
them: (ix. 36) be-  
cause they were dis-  
tressed and scattered,  
as sheep not having  
a shepherd: (xiv. 14  
(b), and *he cured* their  
sick."

"And he received  
them and spake to  
them concerning the  
kingdom of God;  
and them that had  
need of *cure* he  
*healed*."

<sup>1</sup> Mt.-Lk.'s agreement here is one of *fact* rather than of *word*. "Cured" = ἐθεράπευσεν: "healed" = ἰάρο. The former sometimes means "(at)tend" without healing: here, though "heal" would be a better rendering, "cured" is used to distinguish it from Lk.'s verb, "healed," and to assimilate it to Lk.'s noun, "cure, θεραπείας."



(i) (*Mk.-Mt.*) "*had compassion on*" = (*Lk.*) "*received*"

[401] The Septuagint uses of the Greek word "receive [*into one's house, etc.*]"<sup>1</sup> shew that it is almost restricted to the redemption, or deliverance, of Israel. The Hebrew occurs in Isaiah's description of the Messianic Shepherd: "Like a shepherd his flock shall he shepherd; in his arm shall he *receive* (R.V. *gather*) the lambs."<sup>2</sup> In this sense, the Septuagint once translates it "take pity on."<sup>3</sup> Mark is quite justified in rendering it "have compassion on," but Luke is, from the Septuagint point of view, more justified in rendering it "received."

(ii) "*Sheep not having a shepherd*"

[402] Why does Luke (at all events apparently) omit this? Probably because it was not a part of the original Gospel, but a quotation from Zechariah, inserted in the margin of the earliest Hebrew Gospel here to illustrate the obscure and disputed words that follow. Zechariah's words—which are of importance as they may have given rise to the tradition about "curing"—are these: "They go their way like sheep; they are afflicted because there is *no shepherd*," translated by the Septuagint, "They were dried up (or, pulled up) like sheep, and were afflicted because there was *no healing*."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [401*a*] Luke uses ἀποδεχέσθαι, a compound that did not commend itself to the LXX, which prefers εἰσδέχομαι, i.e. "receive into (one's embrace, house, etc.)." This occurs 14 times in Heb. LXX (always = קָבַץ), generally (11) denoting the "reception," "welcome," or "gathering from the Gentiles," of Israel by their Saviour.

<sup>2</sup> Is. xl. 11.

<sup>3</sup> [401*b*] Is. liv. 7 (R.V.), "with great mercies will I *gather* thee." The LXX is perhaps closer to the spirit: "With great pity will I *take pity on* thee (μετ' ἐλέους μεγάλου ἐλεήσω σε)."

<sup>4</sup> [402*a*] Zech. x. 2 "go their way (ἵκαν), *ἐξηράνθησαν*, v.r. *ἐξήρθσαν*. "Healing" = *ἰασις*. The verb means literally, "pluck up tent-pegs to resume a journey." Matthew seems to interpret it as "plucked," "pulled about," "worried," *ἐσκυλμένοι*. Luke may have taken "because there was no healing" as equivalent to "they were in need of cure and could not obtain it."

If this explanation is correct, the Hebrew insertion proved even more obscure than the words it was intended to explain. Mark omits most of the difficult words mistranslated by the Septuagint. Matthew (ix. 36) mistranslates them in a different way, and assigns them to a different period. Luke perhaps retained a vestige of the Septuagint mistranslation ("no healing") in his mention of "those who had need of cure."

(iii) "*Teach . . . many things*"

[403] This may have been an erroneous translation of "Like a shepherd he shepherded them," which was written in the Hebrew Gospel as a fulfilment of Isaiah's prediction "Like a shepherd shall he shepherd."<sup>1</sup> Mark, or some authority followed by him, took this for the reduplicated Hebrew verb, and by reading ך for ך he converted "shepherd" to "know"—as the Septuagint has (*Clue* 7) been shewn to do—and this, taken causatively as "cause to know," was rendered "teach." Then he paraphrased "teaching he taught them" as "he taught them many things."

Matthew and Luke, perhaps influenced by the Septuagint translation of the above-quoted prophecy of Zechariah, regarded "healing" as the meaning of "shepherding." Luke conflated "healing" with Mark's tradition about "teaching," only in a different shape: "spake to them concerning the kingdom of God."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Is. xl. 11, quoted above (401).

<sup>2</sup> [403a] Other confusions that may have a bearing on this passage are 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16 "remedy (רפא),"<sup>1</sup> *ἰαμα*=1 Esdr. i. 49 *προστάξει* (leg. *רפא*): Job. xxiii. 5 "words (פלים)," *ἰάματα* (? leg. פלים as in 2 Chr. vi. 30) <sup>c</sup> A *ῥήματα*: 2 Chr. vi. 30 "forgive (פלים)," *ἰάση*=1 K. viii. 39 *ἔλεως ἔσση*. In 2 Chr. xxx. 20 "the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah and *healed* (*ἰάσατο*) the people," the meaning is "forgave them," or "did not punish them."

§ 34 (a). (*Mk.*) "five," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "not . . . save (or, more than) five"

*Mk.* vi. 38.

*Mt.* xiv. 17.

*Lk.* ix. 13.

"They say (λέγου-  
σιν) (D and SS add  
"to him") Five."

"But they say to  
him, We have *not*  
here save five."

"But they said  
(εἶπαν), (lit.) There  
are *not* to us more  
than five."

[403 (i)] This difference may be explained by the confusion between "not (אֵל)" and "to him (לֵהוּ)," which is recognized by the Masora as occurring fifteen times in the Hebrew text, and which has very frequently influenced the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

The original was probably, "And they said, *Not* (אֵל) [are there] *to us* save (כִּי אֵם) five," in which *emphasis was laid upon "us,"* meaning, "If you want *us* to feed this people, *we* have only five loaves." This construction being unusual, "not" was regarded by Mark as "to him," so that the meaning became, "And they said *to him*, To us [there are] only five." This, as usual, Mark rendered (534 (iii)) by the historic present, and dropped what was superfluous, the result being "They say, five."

Matthew expressed "there are not to us" by "we have *not*," inserting "here" (425 (i)) for emphasis (unless הֵלֶם, "hither," has been confused with אֵם, "bread").

Luke translated literally, except that he gave an improved rendering of the Hebrew "save" (which also means "except," "only," "but") in the shape of "more than."

§ 35. (*Mt.-Lk.*) "that which superabounded," *Mk.* omits

*Mk.* vi. 43.

*Mt.* xiv. 20.

*Lk.* ix. 17.

"And they took  
up broken pieces

"And they took  
up *that which super-*

"And there was  
taken up *that which*

<sup>1</sup> See Gesenius, ed. Oxf., אֵל; the more usual word would be לֵהוּ, but אֵל is used for emphasis as in Ps. cxv. 1 "not unto us."



filling [lit. the fillings of] twelve baskets."	<i>abounded</i> of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full."	<i>superabounded</i> to them of the broken pieces, twelve bas- kets."
--	---	--

[404] A complete explanation of the departure from Mark's "filling" to the later "superabound" is afforded by the hypothesis of an original Hebrew word, literally meaning "filling" or "fullness," but hence used to mean that "over-fullness," or "superabundance," which is to be given to God's ministers as "tithes" or "first-fruits." In Ex. xxii. 29 it is rendered (R.V.) "abundance" (A.V. "first"), but marg. "Heb. *thy fullness*," in Num. xviii. 27 (R.V. and A.V.) "fullness." In Deut. xxii. 9, it means "the whole [of the farmer's labour]," explained in the context as including "seed" and "crop," but the Septuagint translates "whole" by "crop."<sup>1</sup>

[405] Mark has here translated it literally, "the fillings." But this does not give the spirit of the original, which means "the over-filling," possibly suggesting that there "superabounded" as it were tithes to the Apostles. Accordingly Mark himself in the Miracle of the Four Thousand adopts the word "superabundances." And John has "superabound" in the Miracle of the Five Thousand.<sup>2</sup> Thus there is a general consent against Mark's text here. But his error is probably nothing more than literal translation.

§ 36. (*Mt.—Lk.*) the "evil" generation: *Mk.* omits "evil"

Mk. viii. 12.	Mt. xvi. 4.	Lk. xi. 29.
"Why doth this generation seek a sign?"	"A generation <i>evil</i> and adulterous seek- eth after a sign."	"This generation is an <i>evil</i> generation. It seeketh a sign."

<sup>1</sup> [404a] (תכלה) Ex. xxii. 29 ἀπαρχάς, Num. xviii. 27 ἀφαίρεμα, Deut. xxii. 9 γένημα. In Deut. xxii. 9 R.V. has "lest *the-whole-fruit* (marg. *fulness*, תכלה) be forfeited—the seed which thou hast sown and the increase of the vineyard," A.V. "lest the *fruit* of thy seed which thou hast sown and the fruit of the vineyard be defiled," missing the meaning, as the LXX also does.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. viii. 8 περισσεύματα, Jn. vi. 13 ἐπερίσσευσαν.



[406] This adds one more to the numerous instances (7) of confusion arising from the similarity of ט and כ. The original was "evil," and this was read as "why," which is often expressed in Hebrew by "*knowing* what?" It has been shewn (7) that "know" and "evil" are frequently confused in the Septuagint.<sup>1</sup>

[407] That Mark is wrong and Matthew and Luke right, is probable, because Mark's word is comparatively common, and it is a recognised law of documentary evidence that the unfamiliar is generally corrupted to the familiar.<sup>2</sup>

§ 37. (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*The sign of Jonah*"; *Mk. omits*

Mk. viii. 12.

Mt. xvi. 4.

Lk. xi. 29.

"Verily I say (lit.) if there shall be given a sign to this generation."

"A sign shall not be given to it *except the sign of Jonah* [rep. in Mt. xii. 39, "a sign . . . Jonah the prophet"].

"A sign shall not be given to it *except the sign of Jonah.*"

(i) "*If there shall be given*"

[408] "If" sometimes occurs in a Hebrew idiom containing a suppressed adjuration: "[The Lord do thus and thus unto me] *if* there shall be given." In the Septuagint it is frequently translated by a negative, which is found here in the parallel Matthew and Luke. But in the whole of the New Testament there is no other instance of this adjurative idiom except in the Epistle to the Hebrews quoting the

<sup>1</sup> [406a] "Evil" = מרע, "why" = מרע. Comp. Prov. xiii. 19, xix. 23 "evil (מרע)" = γυναις (bis), Prov. xix. 27 "knowledge" = κακός, Sir. iii. 24, "thoughts," lit. "knowings (דעות)," σοφία. In 2 S. xix. 7, and Eccles. vii. 23, "know" and "worse (מרע)" are severally mistranslated and conflated with the correct renderings.

<sup>2</sup> [407a] Why Mk. omits, or Mt. inserts, "adulterous," is a question not strictly within our scope. But "adulterous" = זנה, and "this" = זה, and the former is a rarer word than the latter. Mt. is probably right.

filling [lit. the fillings of] twelve baskets."	<i>abounded</i> of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full."	<i>superabounded</i> to them of the broken pieces, twelve bas- kets."
--	---	--

[404] A complete explanation of the departure from Mark's "filling" to the later "superabound" is afforded by the hypothesis of an original Hebrew word, literally meaning "filling" or "fullness," but hence used to mean that "over-fullness," or "superabundance," which is to be given to God's ministers as "tithes" or "first-fruits." In Ex. xxii. 29 it is rendered (R.V.) "abundance" (A.V. "first"), but marg. "Heb. *thy fullness*," in Num. xviii. 27 (R.V. and A.V.) "fullness." In Deut. xxii. 9, it means "the whole [of the farmer's labour]," explained in the context as including "seed" and "crop," but the Septuagint translates "whole" by "crop."<sup>1</sup>

[405] Mark has here translated it literally, "the fillings." But this does not give the spirit of the original, which means "the over-filling," possibly suggesting that there "superabounded" as it were tithes to the Apostles. Accordingly Mark himself in the Miracle of the Four Thousand adopts the word "superabundances." And John has "superabound" in the Miracle of the Five Thousand.<sup>2</sup> Thus there is a general consent against Mark's text here. But his error is probably nothing more than literal translation.

§ 36. (*Mt.—Lk.*) the "evil" generation: *Mk.* omits "evil"

Mk. viii. 12.

Mt. xvi. 4.

Lk. xi. 29.

"Why doth this  
generation seek a  
sign?"

"A generation *evil*  
and adulterous seek-  
eth after a sign."

"This generation  
is an *evil* generation.  
It seeketh a sign."

<sup>1</sup> [404a] (מלוא) Ex. xxii. 29 ἀπαρχάς, Num. xviii. 27 ἀφαιρέμα, Deut. xxii. 9 γένημα. In Deut. xxii. 9 R.V. has "lest *the-whole-fruit* (marg. *fulness*, מלוא) be forfeited—the seed which thou hast sown and the increase of the vineyard," A.V. "lest the *fruit* of thy seed which thou hast sown and the fruit of the vineyard be defiled," missing the meaning, as the LXX also does.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. viii. 8 περισσεύματα, Jn. vi. 13 ἐπερίσσευσαν.

[406] This adds one more to the numerous instances (7) of confusion arising from the similarity of ט and ר. The original was "evil," and this was read as "why," which is often expressed in Hebrew by "*knowing* what?" It has been shewn (7) that "know" and "evil" are frequently confused in the Septuagint.<sup>1</sup>

[407] That Mark is wrong and Matthew and Luke right, is probable, because Mark's word is comparatively common, and it is a recognised law of documentary evidence that the unfamiliar is generally corrupted to the familiar.<sup>2</sup>

§ 37. (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*The sign of Jonah*"; *Mk. omits*

Mk. viii. 12.

Mt. xvi. 4.

Lk. xi. 29.

"Verily I say (lit.) if there shall be given a sign to this generation."

"A sign shall not be given to it *except the sign of Jonah* [rep. in Mt. xii. 39, "a sign . . . Jonah the prophet"].

"A sign shall not be given to it *except the sign of Jonah.*"

(i) "*If there shall be given*"

[408] "If" sometimes occurs in a Hebrew idiom containing a suppressed adjuration: "[The Lord do thus and thus unto me] *if* there shall be given." In the Septuagint it is frequently translated by a negative, which is found here in the parallel Matthew and Luke. But in the whole of the New Testament there is no other instance of this adjurative idiom except in the Epistle to the Hebrews quoting the

<sup>1</sup> [406a] "Evil" = טרע, "why" = פרוע. Comp. Prov. xiii. 19, xix. 23 "evil (טרע)" = γένους (bis), Prov. xix. 27 "knowledge" = κακός, Sir. iii. 24, "thoughts," lit. "knowings (רעות)," ποσθηδ. In 2 S. xix. 7, and Eccles. vii. 23, "know" and "worse (רע)" are severally mistranslated and conflated with the correct renderings.

<sup>2</sup> [407a] Why Mk. omits, or Mt. inserts, "adulterous," is a question not strictly within our scope. But "adulterous" = נונה, and "this" = זה, and the former is a rarer word than the latter. Mt. is probably right.



[410] It seems highly improbable—from what we know of Mark's scrupulousness in inserting words of Jesus fully, even to the extent of frequent conflations—that he would, on such insufficient grounds, omit an integral portion of a short saying uttered by the Saviour, according to Mark's own account ("Verily I say"), with special solemnity. Moreover, we find Matthew inserting the words "the sign of Jonah" here, although the discourse about Jonah does *not* follow (being placed at an earlier stage).

[411] Rejecting, therefore, the view that Mark knowingly omitted the words, we have to ask whether they may have sprung from a corruption of the text, and, in particular, from that Hebraic interrogative "if" which—especially as it may have been regarded as an adjurative—may well have caused great difficulty to evangelists and scribes. We saw above (372) that the Hebraic interrogative "if," implying a negative, was in one passage probably conflated by Luke into "if not," so that "Are we (lit. *if* we are) to go away?" became "*if* we are *not* to go away." More recently (409c) we found an instance of this very conflation in the LXX. If such a conflation took place here, it would account for the first part of the phrase to be explained, viz. "except" or "if not." Moreover, the context affords additional materials for the construction of an erroneous "except." For it happens that the Hebrew "that" (כִּי) if (אִם) also means "except." Now the Hebrew "that" is often used superfluously to introduce speech. Hence, "he said *that* 'If there shall be given,'" might be interpreted as "he said '*Except* there shall be given.'"

[412] Now let us put ourselves in the position of a very early Evangelist who found written and oral tradition varying between "there shall *not* be given" and "*except* there shall be given," applied to "a sign from heaven." According to the analogy of the LXX, we should expect him to conflate the two, and to attempt to find some meaning for the



more difficult (the latter) that would make sense of the conflation. The word "except" might suggest to many Christians the exceptional sign from heaven given at Christ's baptism in the descent of *a dove*. Hence "dove" might be written in the margin so as to give the meaning "except [*i.e.* only] the sign of the dove shall be given"; and, as "dove" (יונה, genit. יונה) is similar to "shall be given" (יתן), the latter might be dropped as a repetition of the former, the result being "except the sign of the dove."

So far, the statement would be at all events logical:—"there shall no sign be given [from heaven] except the sign of the dove." But objections might arise that that sign was not given to "this generation" but only to John the Baptist. Hence, the stress of controversy might drive some who had committed themselves to this new tradition to look about for a new interpretation of it. Now it happens that *the word "dove" is also identical in Hebrew with "Jonah"*;<sup>1</sup> and the reading "except the sign of Jonah" would commend itself to many because of the typical relation supposed to exist between Jonah and Christ.

Yet the new reading was not without grave difficulties. For could the Resurrection be called "a sign from heaven" (except so far as all divine acts are from heaven)?<sup>2</sup> The perplexity apparent in the attempts of Chrysostom and Syrus Ephraemus to make sense of Matthew affords confirmation of the theory that, as on the one hand Jesus did not use these words, so neither did any Evangelist invent them, but that they arose partly from a corrupt text of Mark, partly from the motive of those who caught at the

<sup>1</sup> [412a] "Jonah" = "Dove" = יונה. "Shall be given" = יתן (hoph.) a very rare form. "Dove" occurs once as a rendering for a form of יונה, in Zeph. iii. 1 "the oppressing (היונה)" ἡ περισσέει.

<sup>2</sup> [412b] It may be urged that "except" in N.T. does not always imply an *exception*. It may mean "but only," *e.g.* "no sign from heaven *but only* the sign [in earth, or, from the depth] of Jonah." But how could this be said if Jesus, both before and after the utterance of these words, worked many "signs" on earth for that "generation"?

corruption as a basis for justifying a tradition that Jonah was a type of Christ, and who committed themselves to the new version before it was perceived to be illogical.<sup>1</sup>

§ 38. (*Mk.*) "look," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "give heed"

Mk. viii. 15.	Mt. xvi. 6.	Lk. xii. 1.
"See, look be- cause-of (lit. from) the leaven . . ."	"See and give- heed because-of (lit. from) the leaven . . ."	"Give - heed to yourselves because-of (lit. from) the leaven . . ."

[413] The phrase "look because of," *i.e.* "beware of," is not supported by instances from any book in the Bible or in Greek literature. But it occurs again in Mark xii. 38, where the parallel Luke has again "give-heed because-of (lit. from)." The Septuagint gives many instances of give-heed because-of," but none of "look because-of." Mark's language, therefore, requires explanation.

The original was "give heed to yourselves *from-the-face-of*" (*i.e.* "because of"), a Hebrew idiom that occurs in the Bible corresponding to the Greek "give-heed because-of (lit. from)." But the compound *preposition* "from-the-face-of" is liable to be confused with the *verb* "face," or "look," used frequently in such phrases as "a door *facing* the south," "a gate *looking* northward," etc. but not applied to human beings. Mark, then, supposing that the compound preposition "from-the-face-of" could mean "look," has erroneously conflated

<sup>1</sup> [412c] We have hitherto found no important instance in which Matthew and Luke have concordantly deviated from Mark owing to Greek corruption. Otherwise, something might be said for the view that "Jonah" arose from that source. Suppose the sentence to have been corrupted (in the first instance by conflative translation) into "No sign shall be given . . . *except the sign* (ΙΜΗΧΜΙΟΝ)." Many ancient MSS. use ο for ω, so that ΙΟΝΑ might = "Jonah." It would be very tempting to scribes, familiar with the Christian view of Jonah as a type of Christ, to suppose that the letters had been confused, and that the true reading was ΙΜΗΙΟΝΑ, "except [that of] Jonah."

( $\alpha_1$ ) "look" and ( $\alpha_2$ ) "because of."<sup>1</sup> Matthew and Luke have rightly followed the Corrector.

### § 39. *The confession of Peter*

Mk. viii. 29.

Mt. xvi. 16.

Lk. ix. 20.

[414] (i) "Thou art the Christ."

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

"The Christ of God."

The only confession of Peter mentioned by John is this, "Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and know that thou art *the Holy One of God*."<sup>2</sup>

Compare the variations in another passage:—

Mk. xiv. 61.

Mt. xxvi. 63.

Lk. xxii. 66–70.

(ii) "Thou [then] art *the Christ the Son of the Blessed*?"

"I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us if thou art *the Christ the Son of God*."

"saying 'If thou art *the Christ*, tell us.' . . . But they all said, 'Thou art then *the Son of God*!'"

In (ii), Mark is most probably in error, because—although it is very common to repeat "blessed is He" after the name of God—no instance is alleged where "the Blessed" (like "the Highest") is substituted for God.

[415] As regards (i), we have to bear in mind that the title "Son of God," by itself, would hardly suffice, in Hebrew, to express the meaning, because Hebrew makes no distinction between "*a* son of God" and "*the* son of God." Hence the same expression might be translated by one Evangelist as "*a*

<sup>1</sup> [413a] "Look" = βλέπετε. The verb נָחַן "turn the face [to, or from]" = βλέπω (14): but, when rendered βλέπω, it always refers to gates, hills, etc., "facing" in a certain direction. The preposition "from-the-face-of" (מִפְנֵי) = (a) "away from," (b) "because of." Mk. probably has in mind two meanings, (a) "look heedfully *because of*," (b) "keep on your guard *away from*."

<sup>2</sup> Jn. vi. 68, 69.



(or, the) son of God," but by another as "a righteous person"; and this actually occurs in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>1</sup>

[416] There is a considerable resemblance between "God" (as frequently represented in Aramaic and sometimes in Hebrew) and the Hebrew phrase "living God" used by Hosea ("sons-of *the living God*") and perhaps here translated by Matthew."<sup>2</sup>

[417] There is also a resemblance, in Hebrew, between "blessed" and "first-born." The two are actually interchanged by the LXX in Chronicles; and, in the original Hebrew of Ben Sira, the margin of the MS. once reads "first-bornship" where the text reads "blessing."<sup>3</sup> Now, though the precise phrase "first-born of God" does not occur in O.T., God is represented as calling the Chosen People His "first-born," and hence the conception appears to have been transferred to the Messiah.<sup>4</sup> Philo frequently speaks of the

<sup>1</sup> [415a] Comp. Mk. xv. 39, Mt. xxvii. 54 "Truly this man was a (or, *the*) Son of God," Lk. xxiii. 47 "Indeed this man was *righteous*." Comp. the saying of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan. iii. 25 (R.V.) "The aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods," but A.V. "like the Son of God," Theod. *ἡμολα υἱῶ θεοῦ*, LXX *ἡμολα υἱῶ θεοῦ*. Probably Theod., and certainly LXX, rendered this "a son of God." "The son of God," where brevity is not required, is sometimes expressed in N.T. by *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*.

<sup>2</sup> "Living God," in Hos. i. 10 "sons of the *living God*," = אֱלֹהִים; "God" = (Aram.) אֱלֵה (v. freq.) (Heb.) אֱלֹהִים (22), אֱלֹהִים (v. freq.).

<sup>3</sup> I Chr. v. 1, 2 mentions the "firstbornship (בְּכֹרָה)," or "birth-right," of Reuben the "first-born." The LXX twice has "blessing," which would be בְּרָכָה. In Sir. xliv. 23b txt. בְּרָכָה is rightly rendered by LXX "blessings." But the marg. reads בְּכֹרָה, "firstbornship" or "birth-right."

<sup>4</sup> See especially Schöttg. (vol. i. p. 121) which, when translated with the quotations somewhat more fully given, is as follows: "Midrash Tehillim on Ps. ii. 7, fol. 3, 4 *I will tell-of the decree: (The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son):* Long ago were the words *told-of* in the decree of the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa. In the Law, Exod. iv. 22 *Israel is my son, my first-born.* In the Prophets, Is. lii. 13 *Behold my servant shall deal wisely.* Similar to this is Is. xlii. 1 [*Behold my servant*] whom I uphold. In the Hagiographa, Ps. cx. 1 *The Lord said unto my Lord,* and Ps. ii. 7, *The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son.* And in another place, Dan. vii. 13 *And behold there came with the clouds of heaven [one like unto a son of man].*" This shows how Jewish tradition identified the nation with the Messiah, or took the former as the type of the latter, and hence attached to the Messiah the firstbornship originally connected with the nation.



Logos as first-begotten.<sup>1</sup> Such expressions as "the first-born of death," "the first-born of the poor" in the Bible, and "the first-born of Satan," said to have been applied to a heretic by the Apostle John, show that the term might naturally be applied by common people to the Messiah.<sup>2</sup> That it was so applied to Christ by Christians there is abundant proof.<sup>3</sup> But, if the Hebrew Original of the present passage (Mk. viii. 29) contained the words "First-born of the living God," the term, though intelligible to Jews, would be likely to perplex Gentiles in the earliest days of the Church until they became familiar with the conception. It is more likely that the rare term "living God" was (or was supposed by Matthew to be) in the original than that it was inserted by Matthew. On the other hand "the Christ," *i.e.* "the Anointed," was intelligible to Gentiles—as signifying an anointed King and Priest. Hence Mark, the earliest Evangelist that wrote for Western Churches, might substitute "the Anointed" for the whole phrase: Matthew might conflate this with the original, altering "First-born" to Son. Luke might accept Mark's word "Christ" but conflate this with "the living God," which however he read as being simply "God."<sup>4</sup>

There is very great uncertainty as to the Hebrew Original of Peter's confession, and a complete discussion of it would require a comparison of Peter's confession as given

Wetstein (on Rom. viii. 29) quotes R. Nathan: "God said to Moses, As I made Jacob first-born (Ex. iv. 22), so will I make King Messiah first-born (Ps. lxxxix. 27)."

<sup>1</sup> Philo (i. 308, 414, 653, etc.) prefers *πρωτόγονος*, the LXX *πρωτότοκος*, except in Sir. xxxvi. 17 (14), and Mic. vii. 1 (neut. pl.).

<sup>2</sup> Job. xviii. 13, Is. xiv. 30, Iren. iii. 3. 3: see also Wetst. on Rom. viii. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 15, 18, Heb. i. 6, Rev. i. 5.

<sup>4</sup> [417a] "First-born" = בכור. In Deut. xxv. 6 it = *παῖδιον*. In Jn. i. 34 "son of God," SS has "the *chosen* (בחר) of God." In the Transfiguration, where Mk. ix. 7, Mt. xvii. 5 have "my *beloved Son*," Lk. ix. 35 has "my *chosen Son*." The Aramaic for "son" is בר. It is found (instead of בן) only in the late Heb. of Prov. xxxi. 2 (bis) and also in the text (disputed, see Gesen. Oxf.) of Ps. ii. 12. "Blessed" = ברוך.

by John: but it may be taken as probable that Mark has paraphrased and that Matthew is closest to the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup>

§ 40. (*Mk.*) "*after three days*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*on the third day*"

*Mk.* viii. 31.

*Mt.* xvi. 21 and *Lk.* ix. 22.

" . . . and after three days      " . . . and *on the third day* be  
*arise* (lit. *stand up*, ἀναστῆναι).      *raised* (lit. *roused*, ἐγερθῆναι)."

(i) (*Mk.*) "*three*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*third*"

[418] As to "days" or "day" it has been shewn above (227) that two traditions might naturally spring up from the prophecy of Hosea. "After three days" might seem to some to conform with the history of Jonah. But "on the third day" was the correct translation of Hosea, and this accorded best with the prevalent accounts of the Resurrection. The latter tradition was generally adopted.

(ii) (*Mk.*) "*arise*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*be raised*"

As regards the words "arise" and "be raised"—which are quite different in Greek—we are told by Mark that when Jesus "raised up" Jairus' daughter, He said to her, "Cumi." This represents a Hebrew word that is occasionally rendered "be raised," but much more frequently "arise." Yet Mark himself translates it by the former word in the story of

<sup>1</sup> [417½] Jn. represents Peter as making a confession of which the first part is Jn. vi. 68 "Thou hast the words of eternal life." Now (a) "thou hast" might well be expressed in Hebrew by "*with thee* [are], אִתְּךָ," and this might be confused with "thou (אתה)" (compare אָתָּה read as אָתִי in 1 K. xx. 40, and as אָתָּךְ "thy signs" in Sir. xlviii. 4): (δ) "Word (דָּבָר)" (parall. in 2 S. vii. 21 to עֶבֶר "servant" in 1 Chr. xvii. 19) might be substituted for the Aramaic בֶּר "son" (which might be retained, as being the very word used by Peter, even in a Gospel written mostly in Biblical Hebrew) if the latter were regarded as a Hebrew word. (c) "Eternal life" is rendered by Delitzsch חַיִּי עֲלָמִים, i.e. "living for the ages"; but this closely resembles (Dan. xii. 7) "him who liveth for ever (חַיִּי הָעוֹלָם)." Hence there is a considerable resemblance between "Thou hast the word(s) of eternal life" and "thou art the Son of Him that liveth for ever," which might be paraphrased as "thou art the Son of the living God."

Jairus. There seemed perhaps this advantage in "raised," or "roused," that it better indicated a miraculous act on the part of God. At all events, St. Paul almost always uses "roused" concerning the Resurrection of Jesus. The synonymousness of the words is indicated by the fact that Ezra and 1 Esdras, and the two versions of the Acts of Pilate, interchange them in parallel passages.<sup>1</sup> Matthew and Luke have adopted the Pauline word.

### § 41. *The Transfiguration*

Mk. ix. 2.

Mt. xvii. 1, 2.

Lk. ix. 29.

"He was metamorphosed before them."

"He was metamorphosed before them, and *his face* shone as the sun."

"And it came to pass, as he prayed, the aspect of *his face* became different."

[419] In Daniel, "his countenance was changed" expresses change to anger or sorrow; and Ecclesiasticus, though once speaking of such change as "for *good* or evil," mostly has the bad sense, *e.g.* "With much whispering he will *change his countenance*."<sup>2</sup> Hence it is unlikely that the Hebrew original used the word "change." More probably *it would borrow the language used in describing the transmutation of the face of Moses*: "*the skin of his face shone*."<sup>3</sup>

[420] In the passage just quoted about Moses, the

<sup>1</sup> [418a] Comp. Ezr. ix. 5 ἤσπ, ἀνέστην = 1 Esdr. viii. 70 ἐξεγερθὲς: Acta Pil. 13 (A) ἠγέρθη, (B) ἀνέστη. Comp. also, for the active, Ezr. ix. 9 ἀναστήσαι = 1 Esdr. viii. 78 ἐγείραι (ἔγει).

It is a remarkable fact that Luke, while frequently using ἀναστῆναι in the Acts, and in those portions of his Gospel which are peculiar to himself, seldom follows Mark in the use of it. The exceptions are three: Mk. ii. 14 (the call of Levi), where it simply means rising from one's seat; Mk. v. 42 (Lk. viii. 55), where it means "rise from one's bed," but might be interpreted in Mk. "was restored to life"; Mk. x. 34 (Lk. xviii. 33) "shall rise again."

<sup>2</sup> Sir. xii. 18 "change his countenance" (*i.e.* desert an old friend), ἀλλοιώσει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. Comp. Dan. iii. 19, v. 6, 9, 10, vii. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Ex. xxxiv. 29 (lit.) "there-became-horned (קרן) the-skin-of (עור) his-face (פניו)."



word translated "shone" means "became-horned [with rays]," and caused differences of translation in very early times. The Septuagint was content to paraphrase it "was glorified," and St. Paul perhaps adopted this. But in Habakkuk (iii. 2) ("he had *rays* [coming forth] from his hand") the Septuagint, followed by our Authorized Version, has "he had *horns*."<sup>1</sup> And Aquila—probably early in the second century—followed by the Vulgate, described the face of Moses as "full of horns." Hence it is not in the least surprising if Mark, who pays very little regard to proprieties of language, provided that it is clear and forcible—paraphrasing the passage for the Western Church, and having regard to the familiar use of the word "metamorphosis" in popular stories about miraculous transmutations—rendered it "he was *metamorphosed*." "His face," by a confusion paralleled in LXX, could be taken to mean "before their face," which might be rendered "before them." This results in "His skin was metamorphosed before them." It only remained to change "his skin" into "he."<sup>2</sup>

Matthew conflated Mark's version with a second one: "(a<sub>1</sub>) And he was metamorphosed before them, (a<sub>2</sub>) *and his countenance shone like the sun*," where a<sub>2</sub> freely, but substantially, expresses the original, except that it omits "skin."

[421] Luke apparently attempted to represent "skin," but was misled by the Septuagint, which confused the Hebrew word with a similar one meaning "colour," "complexion," and frequently rendered "aspect (ὄψις)." Accordingly Luke has "*the aspect* of his face." He also avoids the heathen

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 7, 10; Hab. iii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> [420a] In Hab. iii. 4, Aquila is said in Smith's *Dict. of Bible* ("Horns") to have transl. ἵπ κερῶδης, but the word is not given in Tromm. or Oxf. Concordance. "Before the face of" = κατὰ πρόσωπον in 1 K. viii. 22, but κατέναντι in 2 Chr. vi. 12. In Greek, κ. π. αὐτοῦ "in his countenance," might easily be confused with κ. π. αὐτῶ "before them." But comp. also Ezr. ix. 6 "lift up *my face* to thee" with parall. 1 Esdr. viii. 71 "*before thy face*," i.e. in thy presence: Is. i. 12 "to appear *before me*," marg. "to see *my face*."



associations of the word "metamorphose" by a paraphrase, "became different."<sup>1</sup>

It appears probable then, that, so far as regards the insertion of the word "face," Matthew and Luke returned to the Hebrew original, which was mistranslated by Mark.<sup>2</sup>

§ 42. (*Mk.*) "He knew not what to answer," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "While he was still speaking (or, saying these things)"

Mk. ix. 6.

Mt. xvii. 5.

Lk. ix. 33, 34.

"For he knew not what to answer" (D, "what to say," SS "what he was saying").

"While he was still speaking."

". . . (*a*<sub>1</sub>) not knowing that which he saith. But (*a*<sub>2</sub>) while he was saying these things."

Lk. ix. 32.

"having kept awake."

(i) "While . . . speaking"

[422] "While he was still speaking" would naturally correspond to a Hebrew original like that which prefaces the metamorphosis of King Nebuchadnezzar, literally, "Yet [was the] word in the mouth of the king." There

<sup>1</sup> [421*a*] "Skin (קור)" = (*a*<sub>1</sub>) הִשְׁפִּיט (*a*<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ χρώματος in Ex. xxxiv. 29, 30 (leg. קָרַע = δρασσις in Ezek. i. 4, Dan. x. 6 (Theod.)). In this conflation, the LXX perhaps confused χρώμα with χρώς. Tromm. gives קָרַע = εἶδος (4), δρασσις (3), δψις (6). Dr. C. Taylor informs me that a Midrash on Gen. iii. 21 "coats of skin (קור)" substitutes "coats of light (אור)" alluding to Ps. civ. 2.

<sup>2</sup> [421*b*] Probably so extraordinary a word as קָרַע "become horned," gave rise to many marginal (*a*) alterations or (*b*) paraphrases. Among (*a*) the former may have been קָרַע "bow down," which Lk. may have interpreted as "pray"; among (*b*) the latter, may have been קָרַע (= (1) ἀναλάμπτειν) which might be rendered by Mt. ἔλαμψεν. And קָרַע may have originated קָרַע (= "prayer" twice in late Hebrew), which may have originated Luke's "pray." Professor Marshall (in the *Expositor*) suggests that קָרַע, "pray," may have been confused with קָרַע, "high," in Mk. ix. 2.

the Septuagint, in a conflation, corrupts "yet (עַד)" to "upon (עַל)." But "yet" is far more easily corrupted into "know (יָדַע)." <sup>1</sup>

[423] Even without this corruption, if the original was "Yet [was the] word to him in the mouth," *i.e.* in his mouth, it is very easy to explain the parallelism. For "to him" is repeatedly confused with "not." <sup>2</sup> Hence Mark might take the meaning to be "No longer was there a word in his mouth" (compare "in whose mouth are no reproofs" <sup>3</sup>), *i.e.* "he had not a word to reply."

Luke seems to have conflated ( $a_1$ ) a form of Mark's version with ( $a_2$ ) a corrected form similar in substance to that adopted by Matthew.

## (ii) "Having kept awake"

[424] By changing  $\tau$  into  $\gamma$  "yet" becomes "keep awake." This may explain the extraordinary tradition which Luke inserts in his narrative: "But Peter and those who were with him had been weighed down with sleep: *but having*

<sup>1</sup> [422a] Dan. iv. 31 (lit.) "Yet (וְעַד) [was] the word (מַלְאָכָה) in the king's mouth," Theod. ( $a_1$ )  $\xi\tau\iota$  τοῦ λόγου ἐν στόματι τοῦ βασιλέως ὄντος. The LXX conflates this with " $(a_2)$  and upon (leg.  $\epsilon\gamma$ ) the termination of his word (καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείας τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ)," taking מַלְאָכָה as from מָלַא "fulfils" (and hence "terminate"), and וְעַד, "yet," as  $\epsilon\gamma$ , "upon," and "mouth" as "word."

<sup>2</sup> [423a] Comp. 2 K. viii. 10 "Say *unto him* (Q'ri וְלֵי) thou shalt surely recover," marg. "thou shalt *not* (Kth. מִלֵּי) recover," Hos. xi. 5 "not (מִלֵּי)," אֲטֹפֶה (leg. וְלֵי). In Dan. xi.<sup>17</sup>, LXX omits אֲטֹפֶה (וְלֵי) after מִלֵּי. 2 S. xvi. 18 Hebr. Kth. "not," Q'ri "to him," *i.e.* "his," and so R.V. Such instances are numerous. Comp. Ezr. iv. 2 R.V. txt. and marg. In two passages, 1 S. ii. 16, xx. 2, the neg. is (Gesen. Oxf.), "according to Mass., written וְלֵי."

<sup>3</sup> [423b] Ps. xxxviii. 14. It is doubtful whether Mk. is wrong. His version is less commonplace than that of Mt.-Lk. But on the other hand there would be a tendency to favour a reading that explained how the Apostle could even for a moment place Jesus on the same level as Elias ("he knew not what to say," or, "to answer," or, "what he said"). The question is therefore complicated by possibilities of motive. Moreover the termination of the preceding sentence ("Elijah," מִלֵּיהוּ, or מִלֵּיה) leaves possibilities for textual interpolation of מִלֵּי "not," or וְלֵי "to him."

*kept awake* they saw his glory." It may be an amplified conflation, springing from early variations of Mark's tradition about Peter's "not *knowing*." "But," it may be urged, "*keep awake* is less commonplace than *know*: do not the rules of evidence then indicate that the former was corrupted into the latter?" They would, as a rule; but, in this case, motive may have intervened. Mark's tradition may have seemed to derogate from Peter. It was natural to favour a reading that seemed to re-establish the Apostle's reputation.<sup>1</sup>

§ 43. (*Mk.*) "*faithless*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*faithless and perverse*"

*Mk.* ix. 19.

*Mt.* xvii. 17 and *Lk.* ix. 41.

"O faithless generation."

"O faithless *and perverse* generation."

[425] The words "perverse generation" occur elsewhere in the New Testament only in the Epistle to the Philippians, where St. Paul inculcates purity and sincerity in the midst of a "crooked and *perverse* generation." The Apostle is quoting a contrast, in Deuteronomy (xxxii. 4, 5), between God, "a God of faithfulness," and the spurious and rebellious Israel, "a crooked and *perverse* generation." These two qualities, so far as they express deviation from the God "of faithfulness," may be summed up in the one word "faithless." But the Greek "faithless" may mean "unbeliever," or "incredible," or "untrustworthy." In the Epistles to the Corinthians it repeatedly means "unbelievers," that is, those who are outside the Christian Church, and sometimes without any notion of fault. Hence the Corrector, while not rejecting the ambiguous Greek word, may have added the latter of the two epithets in Deuteronomy so as to shew

<sup>1</sup> *Lk.* ix. 32. The question of originality is too complicated to be discussed here. There is something to be said—even on the ground of "motive"—for the originality of Luke's tradition. Would there not be a tendency against any tradition that connected the Transfiguration with "sleep" so as to suggest "vision"?

that the *unbelief* meant here was *not that of ignorance, but that of perversion.*

§ 43 (a). (Mk.) "*unto me,*" (Mt.) "*to me . . . hither,*"  
(Lk.) "*hither*"

Mk. ix. 19.	Mt. xvii. 17.	Lk. ix. 41.
"Bring-ye him unto (πρός) me."	"Bring-ye him to me (or, for me) (μοι) <i>hither.</i> "	"Lead-thou <i>hither</i> thy son."

[425 (i)] In 403 (i), an instance was given where Matthew seemed to have added "here" for emphasis. And it may be stated that insertions occur in the LXX, both of "here" and "hither," apparently for emphasis or clearness, where it does not occur in the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, where "hither" does occur in the Hebrew, it is sometimes omitted by one or other of the two great MSS., the Vaticanus and the Alexandrinus.<sup>2</sup>

Consequently, without asserting that "hither" was, or was not, in the original, we are able to say that the phenomena harmonize with the hypothesis of translation.

§ 44. (Mk.) "*is,*" (Mt.-Lk.) "*is destined to be*"

Mk. ix. 31.	Mt. xvii. 22 and Lk. ix. 44.
"The Son of man is [to be] betrayed."	"The Son of man <i>is destined</i> <sup>3</sup> to be betrayed."

[426] The same Hebrew tense represents both the Greek present and the Greek future. Mark prefers the

<sup>1</sup> [425 (i) a] Gen. xv. 14 "they shall come out," LXX adds "hither (ᾧδε)," Gen. xlii. 33 "Leave one of your brethren with me," LXX adds "here (ᾧδε)": so, too, Deut. xxxi. 21, Josh. ii. 4 (A), Judg. xiii. 15 (but not A).

<sup>2</sup> [425 (i) b] Judg. xix. 12, 2 S. xviii. 30 (B ins. ᾧδε, A om.), 2 K. x. 23 (A ins. ᾧδε, B om.). In 2 S. i. 10 "I have brought them to my lord *hither* (הנה) (ᾧδε)," A curiously has "unto me"—the expression employed by Mk. here (πρός με)—instead of "hither," the word used by Mt.-Lk. here (ᾧδε).

<sup>3</sup> "Is destined (or, sure)," μέλλει.



Greek present, used in what is commonly called the prophetic sense. Elsewhere, Matthew prefers the Greek future, compare Mark (ix. 12) "he *restoreth* [or, is to restore] all things" with Matthew (xvii. 11) "*shall* restore."

[427] When the Hebrew future is treated by the Septuagint as specially emphatic, the Greek sometimes inserts "is sure," "destined," "shall assuredly," as in Isaiah: "Let now the astrologers . . . save thee from the things that *shall* come upon thee," LXX "*are destined* to come to pass."<sup>1</sup> This is what has been done by the Corrector. Compare Mark (x. 38) "the cup that I [*am to*] *drink*" with Matthew (xx. 22) "that I *am destined to drink*."

[428] Bearing in mind that the same Hebrew word (כי) may mean "but," or "when," or "for (indeed)," or "assuredly," we shall also recognize an ambiguous Hebrew original under—

Mk. viii. 38, Lk. ix. 26.

Mt. xvi. 27.

"*When* the son of man *shall* come."

"*For* the son of man *is destined* to come."

Mk. xiii. 7, Lk. xxi. 9.

Mt. xxiv. 6.

"*But when*<sup>2</sup> ye *shall* hear."

"*But* ye will be *sure* to hear."

§ 45. (Mk.) "*first*" and "*last*," Mt.—Lk. *different*

Mk. ix. 35.

[Mt. xxiii. 8—11].

[Lk. ix. 48.]

[429] (i) "If any      "Be not ye called      " . . . for he that  
man desireth to be      Rabbi . . . but he      is<sup>3</sup> least [lit. less]

<sup>1</sup> [427] Is. xlvii. 13. Comp. Is. xxviii. 24 "*Doth* the ploughman (lit. ploughing) *plough* continually?" Here there is no emphasis on the future, nor indeed any specially future sense at all. The oldest MS. of the LXX (B) renders the Hebrew future by the simple Greek future. But later scribes (A<sup>u</sup>)—erroneously supposing that the reduplicated "ploughing plough" must mean "will assuredly"—insert μέλλει.

<sup>2</sup> "But when" perhaps conflates "but" and "when," while "but . . . sure" conflates "but" and "assuredly."

<sup>3</sup> Lk. ix. 48 "he that is," ὁ . . . ὑπάρχων.

first he shall [or, that is *greatest* [lit. among all [of] *you*, will] be last of all greater] of *you* shall this [man] is *great*." and minister of all." [or, will] be your minister."

The bracketed passages are parallel to Mark in meaning, to some extent, but Matthew's is not parallel in order, and Luke's context differs a good deal from Mark's.

Compare :

Mk. x. 43, 44.	Mt. xx. 26, 27.	Lk. xxii. 26.
(ii) "Not so is it among you: but whoso desireth to become great among you shall [or, will] be <sup>1</sup> your minister, and whoso desireth among you to be first shall [or, will] be servant of all."	"Not so is it among you: but whoso desireth among you to become great shall [or, will] be your minister, and whoso desireth among you to be first shall [or, will] be your servant."	"But ye [are] not so. But the greatest [lit. greater] among you, let him become as the youngest [lit. the younger] and he that is chief as he that doth minister."

The points to be explained are that Matthew and Luke, in (i), (amid many differences) substitute "great(est)" for Mark's "first," and reject Mark's "desireth."

(a) (*Mk.*) "*first*"

[429 (i)] Jesus was probably alluding to the prediction about Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxv. 23), applied by St. Paul to the law of divine election, "*Rab* shall serve Zoër," which is generally translated, "the *elder* shall serve the younger."

There is an ambiguity in the Hebrew of this famous saying.<sup>2</sup> The word *Rab* here rendered "elder" is the root of "Rabbi," and means "great," "master," "ruler," etc. It

<sup>1</sup> W. and H. marg. *ἔστω*.

<sup>2</sup> Apart from other ambiguities—as there is no article and no sign of the accusative, and the object in Hebrew poetry may precede the verb—the meaning might be, apart from the context, "Zoër shall serve *Rab*."

is nowhere else translated "elder."<sup>1</sup> Also, the word rendered "younger (צעיר),"<sup>2</sup> means literally "contracted," "small," and hence, sometimes, "brought low," "despised," "insignificant." It might therefore be used of "inferiors" or "servants." Hence, from the Hebrew point of view, the saying in Genesis might be taken to mean—apart from the context about Jacob and Esau—"The great, or high, shall serve the little, or low."

Again, in the Greek rendering of the words from Genesis, "the greater (ὁ μείζων)" may mean either the greater in *power*, or the greater in *age*.<sup>3</sup> Moreover the Greek word (ἐλάσσων) rendered "younger," is not alleged to mean "younger" (when used absolutely) in any passage of Greek literature except here and in the Epistle to the Romans where the prediction is quoted.<sup>4</sup> Consequently a Greek reader would naturally interpret the Septuagint of Gen. xxv. 23 as meaning "The greater shall serve the less."

<sup>1</sup> [429 (i) a] In Job xxxii. 9, however, where R.V. renders רבים (parall. to וקנים "aged") "great," LXX has πολυχρόνιοι, "abundant in days." Buhl gives רב as "major natu" in Gen. xxv. 23 and the pl. as "grandaevi" in Job xxxii. 9.

In New Heb. רבא and רבה = "elder" as well as "great" (see Levy sub voc., who quotes, "Who is greater (רבה), the teacher of the Borajtha or the teacher of the Gemara?").

<sup>2</sup> [429 (i) δ] The verb צער is rendered in Job xiv. 21 (R.V.) "brought-low," but LXX "become little (or, few)," ὀλίγοι γίνονται. In Jer. xxx. 19 (R.V.) "I will multiply them and they shall not be few, I will also glorify them and they shall not be small" (LXX ἐλαττωθῶσιν) the context indicates that "small" means the opposite of "glorious." In Jer. xiv. 3, the adj. צער is rendered by R.V. txt. "little-ones," but marg. "inferiors," LXX "their young-men (τοὺς νεωτέρους αὐτῶν)."

<sup>3</sup> [429 (i) ε] "Greater (μείζων)" (Tromm.) occurs less than twenty times, in any sense, in LXX. It = "older" (8). When meaning "older," it never = רב, except in the above-quoted Gen. xxv. 23. The ambiguity of "great (μέγας)" may be illustrated by Gen. xxxviii. 11, 14, Exod. ii. 11, where "become great (μέγας γενέσθαι)" means "grow up," compared with Exod. xi. 3 where the same Greek means "become powerful, or eminent."

Another Greek word to express "older" would be πρεσβύτερος. But as this means also "elder" (comp. "Presbyter") it might introduce ambiguity of another kind: πρεσβύτερος in LXX mostly means an Elder or Ruler.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. ix. 12, where Wetstein quotes several instances of the Latin use of "minor" to mean "younger," but none of ἐλάσσων. L.S. make no mention of such a use, and do not quote Gen. or Rom.



[429 (ii)] The word "serve" in the context affords an additional possibility of ambiguity. Besides being liable to be confused (as other Hebrew verbs are) with its causative form ("make to serve"), this particular verb is sometimes used, in the active form, with the preposition "with," to mean "*serve-oneself with*," i.e. "*employ for service*," i.e. cause to serve. The prediction in Genesis that the Israelites should "serve" the Egyptians is mistranslated by the LXX "cause to serve" (the Egyptians being taken as the causers) and the mistake is reproduced in Stephen's speech in the Acts.<sup>1</sup>

[429 (iii)] Philo, in his comment (extant in Latin), on the Esau-Jacob prediction,<sup>2</sup> takes it as indicating that, in every human being, vice exists before virtue, but is ultimately dominated by the latter. Josephus gives a different explanation. His account of the prediction is, that, of the two nations, "that which *seemed to be the less* would take precedence of the greater," meaning that Israel, though at first *seeming to be less powerful* than Edom, would ultimately predominate.<sup>3</sup> There could be no question of "seeming" as to precedence in time. It may be therefore assumed that he takes *Zoër* to mean "less," and it is a reasonable inference that he takes *Rab* not to mean "elder" but "greater." Immediately afterwards he calls Esau "the elder (*πρεσβύτερον*)," and Jacob "the younger (*νεώτερον*)."

[429 (iv)] The difficulty of interpreting the prediction

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xv. 13 "shall serve them," LXX "enslave them," δουλώσουσιν αὐτοῖς (Acts vii. 6 δ. αὐτό). The idiom "serve-oneself with" is paraphrased in Lev. xxv. 39 (lit.) "thou shalt not *serve-thyself* in him (with) the-service-of a servant," LXX "he shall not *serve thee* with the service of a house-servant." In Jer. xxv. 14 (R.V.) "shall serve themselves of," marg. "have served themselves, or, made bondmen," LXX om., but Q marg. has ἐδούλευσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς. In all these cases, "serve" = עָבַד.

<sup>2</sup> *Quaest. Gen. iv.* § 157 (P. A. 366), "Bonum . . . serotinum et adventicium, pravitas ab infantia pene consistit, sed tamen regitur a iuveniore" (see 430a). In i. 105 he quotes the LXX without indicating his interpretation of the words "greater" and "less."

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. *Ant.* i. 18. ἰ τοῦ δὲ μείζονος προτερήσῃν τὸ δοκοῦν ἔλασσον εἶναι.



"[the] great[er] (*Rab*) shall serve [the] little" is increased by the preceding words, "[*The one*] people shall be stronger than [*the other*] people." Is "[the one] people" Edom? But Edom did not become "stronger." To make sense, one may say "*at first* stronger"; but then fairness may seem to demand that we should also say "shall *at first* serve."

There is a Talmudic tradition that *Rab* was Jacob, not Esau, and that Edom signified Rome: "Two nations. This means two lords; out of Jacob will descend *Rabbi*, who will be a prince, a lord over the Jews: and out of Esau will descend Antoninus, who will be a king over (the children of) Esau."<sup>1</sup> Startling as this interpretation is, it has reason on its side so far as this, that it takes *Rab* as "great" which it does mean, and not as "elder," which it never means (except conjecturally here). Taking "great" to mean "*really* great," the Talmudist regards the words as predicting that Israel, though really great, shall be subjected to Rome, which, in spite of its material greatness, might be called by a Jew really "little."<sup>2</sup>

[429 (v)] Coming to Christian interpretation, we find St. Paul in one passage evidently taking "the greater" as having once meant Esau: but he goes on to apply the prediction so as to suggest that *now* it means Israel after the flesh, *i.e.* the Church of the Pharisees, great in its own estimation, but made inferior to "Israel after the spirit," *i.e.* to the despised Church of Christ.<sup>3</sup> Similarly Luke's Gospel,

<sup>1</sup> *Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis*, P. A. Hershon, Hodder and Stoughton, 1885 (p. 153). The same author in *The Pentateuch according to the Talmud*, Bagster and Sons, 1883 (p. 359) says "Read not גוים *nations*, but גרים *men*. (The Massorah gives the latter reading.) These are *Rabbi* (compiler of the Mishnah) and Antoninus (the emperor of Rome, which the Rabbis identify with Edom . . .)."

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the saying of the Egyptian priest in Plato (*Timaeus* § 3 p. 22 B) to the Greek visitor, "You Greeks are always *children*." If *Rab* was interpreted as Israel, some might regard the prediction as fulfilled in the bowing down of Jacob and his children to Esau (Gen. xxxiii. 8): but in that case the words (Gen. xxvii. 40) "thou shalt shake his yoke from off thy neck," would seem to suit Jacob better than Esau.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. ix. 12-31.

in the parable of the Prodigal Son, appears to find in "the elder brother" a type of Israel after the flesh, *i.e.* the Church of the Pharisees.<sup>1</sup>

[429 (vi)] That Jesus had in view here this ancient prediction of Genesis is made probable by the following considerations: (1) the rarity of the word "greater," and especially of this contrast between "the greater" and "the less" in the Bible; (2) the important part necessarily played by this remarkable prophecy in all Jewish discussions about "the greater" and "the less," which may reasonably be supposed to have been frequent;<sup>2</sup> (3) the variations of the synoptists ("first," "greatest," "chief," "last," "minister," "youngest"), which point to the ambiguous words in Genesis. To these may be added the fact that (4), in Matthew's version, there appears to be a preparation for an allusion to the prediction about *Rab*, in a preceding mention of *Rabbi*: "Be not ye called *Rabbi* . . . but he that is *Rab* among you . . ."

[429 (vii)] We are now in a position to understand why Mark, in both his versions of Christ's doctrine on the greater and the less, used the word "first" to denote "the greater." As Josephus, in his paraphrase of the prediction, used the verb "to be *the first* (*πρωτερεῖν*)," so Mark, in his paraphrase, used the adjective "first" to express a difficult and disputed term connected by many with the word "elder," which implied "first-born." An accidental coincidence in the Greek context of the passage in Genesis might help to induce Mark to employ this word. It happens that, in Genesis, immediately after being called "(the) great (one)," Esau is called "the first," rendered by the Septuagint "first-born." Mark may have similarly rendered "Rab" here

<sup>1</sup> Lk. xv. 25-32.

<sup>2</sup> Beside the two synoptic passages quoted above, comp. Mt. xi. 11 (Lk. vii. 28) about John the Baptist than whom none is "*greater*" among those "born of women," but "the *less* (or, *least*) in the kingdom of heaven is *greater* than he."

freely "first," while Matthew and Luke have preferred the Septuagint rendering "greater" or "elder."<sup>1</sup>

(β) (*Mk.*) "*desireth*," omitted (in (i)) by *Mt. and Lk.*

[430] It was shown in *Clue* (164) that Matthew's "desirest to be perfect" was probably in accordance with the Hebrew (lit.) "*is it in thy mind to become*," which was misunderstood by Mark. So here the original seems to have been, "a man *in-whose-mind-it-is* to be great." This might easily be confused with "a man *in whose mind is greatness*," i.e. who is by nature great.<sup>2</sup>

(γ) *Ambiguity of "shall be"*

[431 (i)] Mark, as it stands ("he shall, or will, be last"), is liable to be completely misunderstood as though the words conveyed a warning that any one aiming at being first shall be punished by being degraded to be last. This arises from the fact that, in Hebrew, "he shall be" may be either (i) a prediction "he *will* be," or (ii) a warning "he *shall* be," or (iii) an exhortation "he *must* be, *should* be." Moreover "be" may mean "become." Matthew and Luke, who regard the words not as the statement of a spiritual law but as a precept, agree in substituting the second person, "you," for the third, "any man." Luke also introduces the hortative "*let him become*."

<sup>1</sup> [429 (vii) a] Gen. xxv. 25 "and the *first* (יְשׁוּעָה) came forth red," ἐξήλαθεν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πρωτότοκος πυρράκης. This is the only instance where the Hebrew "first" (owing to special context) is rendered "first-born son."

<sup>2</sup> [430a] "Desire (תִּשְׁכַּח), when preceded by בִּי, is confused in Hosea x. 10 (AQ) with בָּנִי, in I S. xxiii. 20 with אִנִּי, in Mic. vii. 1 with אִמִּי. It might easily be confused with Aram. תִּשְׁכַּח (Heb. שִׁי) = ὑπάρχειν, a word used in Lk. ix. 48.

Philò (*Quaest. Gen.* iv. § 157 (P.A. 366)) says, somewhat obscurely, "pravitas . . . regitur a iuveniore, non temporis lege, sed naturae." Does this mean that vice is dominated by virtue, the younger, not by the law of this world (temporis = αἰῶνος) but by the law of [divine] nature, i.e. virtue is by nature the "first-born," or "greater," and entitled to rule?



All the variations indicate two translations from a Hebrew original, of which Mark alone has twice (Matthew once) recorded one detail (the "desiring"); but Luke (in his second version) has most clearly brought out the hortatory purpose.

(δ) *Christ's meaning*

[431 (ii)] John's narrative of the washing of the feet of the disciples by Jesus had perhaps, beside other and far higher objects, that of clearing up misunderstandings concerning Christ's answer to the question "Who [is] the greatest?"<sup>1</sup>

This resembles the question "Who is the strongest?" discussed in Esdras,<sup>2</sup> and may well have been an old and familiar one in Hebrew literature. In Christ's time, the Rabbi—that is, the "great" or "strong" one—was perhaps the most powerful influence in Judaea. "*Rab*" was more powerful among the Jews than Rome, and the rule of the former seemed to some of Christ's countrymen the type of God's rule. To Jesus it did not seem so. Going back to the very first passage in which the epithet *Rab* is applied to man, He takes an old and obscure tradition, capable of being narrowed to immoral conclusions, and spiritualises it, or creates it anew, as He created anew the rule of "an eye for an eye." He says, in effect, "Be not ye called *Rab* among men; but if ye would be *Rab* in the sight of God, make yourselves servants of Zoer. The way to become great is to make yourselves little."

<sup>1</sup> Mk. ix. 34 *τις μείζων*. But D has "Who *is to become* (γένηται) the greatest of them," SS. "Who *should be* greatest?" Mk. omits "is." Mt. xviii. 1 (*τις ἄρα μείζων ἔσται*;) inserts "is," as though the meaning were, "Who is *really* greatest?" and that this is his view is confirmed by the fact that he adds "in the kingdom of heaven."

Lk. ix. 46 has *τις ἀν ἐμὲ μείζων*, "as to who might be the greatest."

<sup>2</sup> 1 Esdr. iii. 5-iv. 40, introduced by the words, "Let us each utter a discourse [as to] *who might be strongest*" (ὅς ὑπερσχύσει).



## § 46. "Salt"

Mk. ix. 50.

"(a<sub>1</sub>) Salt is good; but, if the salt become saltless, wherewith will ye flavour it? (a<sub>2</sub>) Have in yourselves salt and (a<sub>3</sub>) be at peace with one another."

Mt. v. 13.

"Ye are the salt of the earth; but, if the salt become *insipid* [lit. foolish], wherewith shall it be salted?"

Lk. xiv. 34.

"Salt therefore is good; but, if even (*καὶ*) the salt become *insipid* [lit. foolish], wherewith shall it be flavoured?"

(i) (*Mk.—Lk.*) "good": *Lk.* adds "therefore": (*Mt.*) "ye are"

[432] The use of the second person in Matthew ("ye"), and its omission in Luke, who inserts "therefore," may be explained from the fact that a Hebrew word meaning "therefore" not only resembles, but is actually confused with, a form of "to you," which may mean "[belonging] to you." In one passage of Zechariah the Authorised Version has "you," where the Revised Version has "Verily" (the same Hebrew word as "therefore"). In the recovered Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, where the text has "to you" (omitted by the Septuagint), the Editors suggest "therefore." In Isaiah, "*therefore* have I called" is rendered by the Septuagint "announce *to them*," and "to them" is frequently confused with "to you."<sup>1</sup>

[433] The next point to be considered is Mark's "good," adopted also by Luke. As a working hypothesis, suppose the Original to have been "Ye have the salt," literally, "To-you [is] salt." If "to you" (לכם) gave rise to a variant "there-

<sup>1</sup> [432a] Zech. xi. 7, Sir. xlv. 8, Is. xxx. 7 (LXX leg. ὅθεν): לכם = "to you," ἵνα = "therefore," besides meaning fem. "to you": καλὸν = "well," or "good" (433), καλῶς, which in many MSS. would be written καλός. This might be corrected to καλός, i.e. καλόν. In Ruth i. 13 "therefore (ἵνα)" is twice rendered "them" by LXX; and comp. Mk. iv. 24 "And he began to say to *them*, Beware what ye hear," with Lk. viii. 18 "Beware *therefore* how ye hear."

fore" (לֵךְ), a word frequently mistranslated in LXX, a third variant may have been כֵּן. This word could not mean "good" in the ordinary predicative sense; but it means "right," and is frequently used in the phrase "*rightly* said," "*well* said." Once it is used in O.T. absolutely, without "said," to mean "Right!" "True." In Greek, as in English, this might be expressed by "Good!" (καλῶς).<sup>1</sup> Among various interpretations of this difficult passage, one may have erroneously substituted "good" (כֵּן) for "to you," so as to convert "*To you* is salt" into "*Good* is salt." But, as will be seen below, the process may have been reversed. "Good" may have been corrupted into "to you." Or "good" and "to you" may both be additions intended to complete what seemed to be incomplete sense.

(ii) *Probable corruption in Mark's context*

[434] Luke omits the whole of the preceding discourse in Mark about "cutting off" any member that causes a man "to stumble." Matthew condenses the discourse, omitting a passage (immediately preceding the passage under discussion), part of which is apparently quoted from the last verse of Isaiah, (Mk. ix. 48-9) "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire."

There is an antecedent presumption that any passages of Mark omitted by one or both of the later Synoptists appeared to the latter corrupt, obscure, or erroneous. And certainly these words are extremely obscure, and abrupt, apparently bringing together two kinds of fire, that of Gehenna, and that of "salt," without clearly distinguishing between them. Moreover, Codex D reads "Every *sacrifice*

<sup>1</sup> [433a] Josh. ii. 4 R.V. "Yea (כֵּן)," Gesen. Oxf. "Right!" A.V. "thus," LXX αὐτοῖς λέγουσα. Comp. Rom. xi. 20 "Thou wilt say then, 'Branches . . . that I might be grafted in.' *Well* (καλῶς)," for which Delitzsch has כֵּן הוא. Wetst. ad loc. indicates that καλῶς was adopted as a Jewish word.

shall be salted with salt," and the Arabic Diatessaron conflates this with Mark's text, which itself, as will be seen below, appears to contain conflation. It has also been shewn (289a) that אש, "fire," may be easily confused with אשה, "sacrifice"; and both are easily confused with איש, or אנוש, "man,"<sup>1</sup> which may be latent under Mark's "Every one."

The classical passage about the salting of sacrifices prescribed that Israel should *always* salt them. This was expressed literally in the words "Thou shalt not *cease*, lit. cause to-rest, or, *keep-Sabbath*, to salt." Schöttgen quotes a Jewish tradition that replied to the question, what kind of salt must be used for the salting of sacrifice, by quoting the Levitical precept and by concluding that it must be "salt that did not rest on the Sabbath," that is, salt from the Dead Sea.<sup>2</sup> Ezekiel also speaks of "salting" as following washing, in the case of a newly-born child.<sup>3</sup> The metaphorical use of "salt" appears to have existed in New Hebrew proverbs as well as in Greek and Latin: a youth was called "salted" when he was "quick-witted"; beneficence was said to be the "salt" of wealth: and in the proverb, "Discard *salt* and throw the flesh to the dog," the "salt" is said to have meant the soul.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore antecedently probable that Christ's doctrine might include some reference to the positive and ever-present purification with the salt of the Spirit as distinct from the negative purification of "cutting off." But if Mark's Original expressed this, it has been so corrupted and obscured in the earliest Greek Gospel that the later Synoptists have partly, or wholly, omitted it.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Sir. vii. 17 "the hope of *man* (אנוש) [is the] worm," LXX, "the vengeance on the impious [is] fire (δρεβοὺς πυρ) and worm" (leg. אש וזחל).

<sup>2</sup> Lev. ii. 13, Schöttg. (i. 19-20, on Mt. v. 13).

<sup>3</sup> Ezek. xvi. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Levy, s.v. מלח, vol. iii. pp. 126-7.

<sup>5</sup> [434a] Mk.'s words "their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" are from Is. lxvi. 24. The reason why Mt. omits them may be that they were an early gloss added to explain or emphasize the meaning of "Gehenna."

[434b] As regards the original of Mk.'s "salted," it may be noted that,



(iii) *The Original*

[435] There are difficulties in the way of accepting the present text of Matthew as representing the Original. In the first place, is it likely that if Jesus called the disciples the salt of the world, Mark and Luke would omit such words while giving their context? Then, too, if "salt" means "the Spirit," would it not be much more likely that the disciples should be said to *have* the Spirit than to *be* the Spirit? It may be objected that Matthew's version proceeds to call the disciples "the light of the world," and, if light, why not "salt"? But the former may be as erroneous as the latter. According to John, Christ is "the light of the world": and the Christian doctrine is that we *have* Him as our light, or, at most, that we are "lights ( $\phi\omega\sigma\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ )" (Phil. ii. 15), but never that we are "the light ( $\tau\omicron\delta\ \phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ )."  
Antecedently, then, we should rather expect the Gospel to say something to this effect, "*Have* ye (or, *Ye have*) the salt? Then beware lest it lose its savour. *Have* ye (or, *Ye have*) the light? Then let your light shine before men." Yet, if this was in the Original, why should it have been corrupted, the thought, the words, and the construction, being all perfectly clear and simple? We have therefore to consider the possibility of another Original.

In Proverbs, the Hebrew "is ( $\text{וְ}$ )" is often used to express the existence of something *good as far as it goes but leaving room for something better*, e.g. (Prov. xx. 15) "There *is* gold and the abundance of rubies; but the lips of knowledge are a precious jewel." The word is also used to emphasize

although in the words peculiar to himself ("Every one shall be *salted*") he uses the verb-form of "salt," yet in the next verse, where Mt. has "salted" he has "flavoured." The word  $\text{כִּן}$  is frequently used of "preparing" or "setting" the heart, for the service of God (2 Chr. xii. 14, xix. 3, xxx. 19) and also Zeph. i. 7 of "preparing" a sacrifice. If this was the Hebrew original of "salted" in Mk. ix. 49, coming as it does just before the word "good" in Mk. ix. 50, it suggests that  $\text{כִּן}$  and  $\text{טוֹב}$  may have been confused together.



existence. In three instances where the Hebrew has simply "there is" (*e.g.* Prov. xxiii. 18 "there *is* a reward," and see Prov. xxiv. 14 and Job xi. 18), the LXX inserts "for *thee*," or "of *thee*." May not the Editors of the Hebrew Gospel or the Greek translators have similarly made additions here? Taking "salt *is*" as an incomplete sentence, some may have added "good," meaning "good as far as it goes"; others "ye," meaning "ye are the salt"; others "to you," meaning "ye have," or "have ye"; and out of some of these marginal suggestions might spring the reading "therefore."

The details of the Original must be left matters of conjecture; but, in addition to the possibilities of confusion above-mentioned between כֵּן, לֵכֵן, and לָכֵן, the mention of יֵשׁ suggests another possibility of error, namely, that יֵשׁ, "is," may have been read by some as יֶשֶׁר, "right," once rendered by the LXX "good (καλός)," Mark's word here. The final impression left by all these considerations is that the three Evangelists are dealing with one Hebrew Original, variously interpreted.<sup>1</sup>

#### (iv) "Of the earth"

[436] Was this a part of the Original or inserted by Matthew? Probably it is an insertion, as also "of the world" is in what follows ("ye are the light of the world")—the addition being made for definiteness, in each case.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It should be added that in Greek, as well as in Hebrew, "ye [are] the salt" could easily spring from a corruption of "ye have," lit. "to you [there is]." In Greek, "ye [are]" might be ὡς (i.e. ὑμεῖς), and "ye have" might be ὡς (i.e. ὑμῶν). In Heb. "ye are" might be יֵשׁ, and "ye have" (written as one word) יֵשׁ. Neither of these corruptions is improbable, but the probability of either is diminished if it must be supposed to be repeated in Mt. v. 14 "ye are the light." Hence it becomes more easy to suppose that Mt. added "ye are" from inference as the LXX added "to thee" or "of thee" in Prov. xxiii. 18 quoted above and in Prov. xxiv. 14, Job. xi. 18.

<sup>2</sup> [436a] Mt. v. 14 "of the world (κόσμου)." The words should probably run, "Ye have the light of the world. A beacon (נֹר) set on a hill cannot be hid": עִיר, "city," has been substituted for נֹר, "beacon," as it has been for (Is. xxxii. 18, xxxiii. 20) נֹר, for (Nahum ii. 6) נֹר, for (Josh. xv. 10, 2 K. xxiii. 16, 2 Chr. xxi. 11, Is. lxvi. 20) נֹר, and for (2 S. viii. 11) נֹר (Tromm.).

Similarly, although the Psalmist uses the phrase "from the beginning" absolutely, Matthew (according to R.V. and some of the best MSS.) has "from the beginning (or, foundation) *of the world*," when actually quoting from the Psalm. In another passage, all the MSS. of Matthew have "from the beginning *of the world*."<sup>1</sup>

(v) *Signs of conflation in Mark*

[437] In whatever way Matthew's tradition "ye are the salt" came into existence—whether as an integral part of, or as a corruption from, the Original Gospel—it has been shewn to be easily interchangeable, either through Greek or through Hebrew corruption, with "ye have salt," or "have ye salt."<sup>2</sup> But it has also been shewn that "ye have salt" might be confused with "salt is good." It follows that "ye are the salt," "have ye salt," and "salt is good," may be three versions of one Original: and the last two (both of which occur in Mark at a slight interval) may be conflations.

Instead, however, of simply saying "Have salt," Mark says "Have salt *in yourselves*," meaning that the source of purification is not to be external but internal, the Spirit dwelling in the heart. This also implies a "salting" not at stated intervals but constantly going on, one that—according to the Jewish tradition above (434) quoted—"does not rest on the Sabbath."

But this is a metaphor. What is the prose precept

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xiii. 35 ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου: a quotation from Ps. lxxviii. 2 (LXX ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), where the Heb. and LXX omit "of the world." Most MSS. of Mt. omit κόσμου, but DL insert it. Mt. xxv. 34 has ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Mt. xxiv. 21 has κόσμου where the parall. Mk. has κτίσεως.

<sup>2</sup> "Have ye salt" might be taken interrogatively as meaning "if ye have salt," or imperatively. If ὦ was in the Original, it could not *rightly* be translated so as to have an imperative meaning. But the LXX occasionally renders it by the future, and the future might be taken by a Greek Evangelist as having an imperative force. Instances of ὦ rendered by LXX ἔσται occur in Numb. ix. 20, 21, Prov. xix. 18, xxiii. 18, xxiv. 14 (in Numb. ix. 20, 21, Prov. xxiv. 14, the Heb. is preceded by ἵ).

implied in "Have salt in yourselves (*ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*)"? If "salt" means the Spirit that Christ bequeathed to His disciples, does not this imply "peace" ("*Peace* I leave with you, my *peace* I give unto you")? Hence Mark's words seem to lead directly to the words in the Colossian Epistle (iii. 15), "Let the *peace of Christ* arbitrate (*βραβεύετω*) in your hearts." But is this "peace" mere internal calm, so that the "arbitration" is merely between one desire and another in a single heart? The Colossian letter suggests that "the peace of Christ" means more than this, and has a collective aspect, for it continues, "to which [peace] also ye were called *in one body*," and this is implied in the Ephesian letter, bidding us (iv. 3) "keep the unity of the *Spirit* in the bond of peace."

A direct prose version of Mark's "Have salt *in yourselves*" would be "Have peace *in yourselves*." But this would be ambiguous. It might mean "Have peace, each man in his own heart, independently of external things or persons." But it might also mean, and, as a fact, it does mean in the first epistle to the Thessalonians (v. 13 *εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*) "Have peace *with one another*." The ambiguity of the words in that epistle has caused some to read "them (*αὐτοῖς*)" for "yourselves (*ἑαυτοῖς*)."<sup>1</sup> The prospect of ambiguity here has probably caused Mark to substitute for "in yourselves" the unambiguous "along with one another (*μετ' ἀλλήλων*)": but it appears to have been originally "have peace *in yourselves*," and to have been a marginal explanation of the words "have salt in yourselves." If that is the case, the precept about peace (as well as the precept about salt) is part of a conflation, and its omission by Matthew and Luke becomes intelligible.

(vi) (*Mk.*) "saltless," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "insipid" (*lit.* "made foolish")

[437 (i)] This divergence is exactly illustrated by a passage in Ezekiel, where Aquila has Mark's word "saltless,"



but two other MSS. severally "*folly*" and "*unprepared.*" The Hebrew word is rare, and means "something to be spit out (because it has lost its virtue or essence)," <sup>1</sup>

§ 46 (a). (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*it came to pass*<sup>2</sup> . . . *Galilee*"

Mk. x. 1.	Mt. xix. 1.	Lk. xvii. 11.
"And thence having arisen he cometh into the boundaries of Judaea and beyond the Jordan."	"And <i>it-came-to-pass</i> <sup>2</sup> when Jesus had finished all these words, he removed from <i>Galilee</i> and came into the boundaries of Judaea beyond the Jordan."	"And <i>it-came-to-pass</i> <sup>2</sup> in [his] going to Jerusalem, (lit.) and he was going through the midst of Samaria and of <i>Galilee.</i> " <sup>3</sup>

[438 (i)] The threefold parallelism here is so obscure that it may very reasonably be disputed. The words in Mark follow the doctrine about "salt." But those in Matthew do not. Moreover, the words in Luke are not parallel in arrangement to those in Mark or in Matthew, and differ in substance from both. The following remarks, therefore, do not aim at demonstrating the similarity between Matthew and Luke to be of the nature of an "agreement" with a Corrector: but they may be of use in considering other passages where "*Galilee*" occurs in the Synoptists.

[438 (ii)] The identity of so many consecutive words in Mark and Matthew—"the boundaries of Judaea [and] beyond the Jordan," an expression that occurs here alone in the New Testament—makes it almost certain that these two writers, at all events, are referring to the same event. And one probable cause of their difference from one another

<sup>1</sup> [437 (i) a] Ezek. xiii. 10, 14, 15 "*untempered*" (לֶחֶם), LXX (leg. as from לֶחֶם "fall") (thrice) πεσείται. Aqu. ἀναλον, Q. ἀφροσύνη, Q. marg. ἀναπτύψ. Comp. 2 S. xxii. 27 (לֶחֶם) with parall. Ps. xviii. 26 (לֶחֶם).

<sup>2</sup> "It came to pass." For these words, see 438 (v) c.

<sup>3</sup> R.V. Marg. "between Samaria and Galilee." The MSS. vary between διὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσου, and μέσον.



can be readily indicated. "Galilee" means "region," or "surrounding country." It has been shown to have been probably (128-9) conflated by Mark as "(a<sub>1</sub>) *the surrounding country of* (a<sub>2</sub>) *Galilee*," and by Luke in a passage in which he speaks, first, of Jesus going "into *Galilee*," and then of His fame going forth "in the whole of the *surrounding country*." It was also shown (128) that, in Joshua, "*the region about Jordan*" (A.V. "*borders of Jordan*") was rendered by the LXX "*Galaad of Jordan*," and by Codex Alexandrinus "*Galiloth of Jordan*."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, as regards Isaiah's prophecy about "*Galilee of the nations*," it was pointed out that R.V. has, in the margin, "district," instead of "Galilee." Now Mark's Greek word "boundaries" may be used here, or at all events might be naturally supposed to be used here, for "parts," "district," or "territory."<sup>2</sup> And it happens that the Hebrew for "boundary" is very similar to the Hebrew for "circle" or "Galilee," and that the two are actually confused once by the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Hence Matthew may have taken Mark's "boundaries" to mean "region," which he interpreted as "Galilee." Then, since "*into Galilee*" seemed to make no sense, he might take "in(to)" as "from"—a most frequent (371, 444 (i), 516) error—thus obtaining "*from Galilee*." This he may have conflated with Mark's own tradition "into the boundaries of Judaea."

[438 (iii)] In considering what may have been an original Hebrew version we have to give weight to the

<sup>1</sup> Josh. xxii. 11. It might have been added that in Josh. xxii. 10, the same Hebrew is rendered by LXX "*Galgala of Jordan*" (A "*Galiloth*").

<sup>2</sup> [438 (ii) a] See Swete's note on Mk. x. 1: "τὰ ὅρια τ. 'Ι., not the frontier only (as Origen in *Mt.* οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ μέσα, ἀλλ' ὅλον τὰ ἄκρα) but the region as a whole: cf. vii. 24." This is perhaps not quite certain. The meaning of ὅρια in Mk. vii. 24 is doubtful. But in view of the double meaning of ὅρια in LXX (= גבול) it is fairly probable here that it means not "outskirts," but "territory."

<sup>3</sup> [438 (ii) b] Josh. xiii. 2 "regions (גלילות)," ὅρια (leg. גבול). The early Christian use of "Galilee" may have been influenced by the fact that (*Ency. BETHSAIDA*) "by 84 A.D. the east coast was definitely attached to the province." The east coast may have been popularly called Galilee before that date.

influence of prophecy in shaping the narrative of the earliest Christian Evangelists. It was shown above (159) that Mark's inclusion of "Idumaea" in the names of districts that sent disciples to Christ, was probably caused by a prophecy of Amos. Now the present passage in Mark is the only one in which he describes Jesus as visiting the region "beyond *Jordan*." But this phrase occurs in a well-known prophecy of Isaiah (expressly quoted by Matthew) predicting that the light of the Gospel is to reach "by the way of the sea, *beyond Jordan*, the region (or, Galilee) of the nations." Antecedently, it is probable that Mark had that prophecy in his mind. But, if he had, he may have been influenced by the remarkable fact that the best MSS. of the LXX (after the word "nations") make the following addition, possibly intended as a conflation: "the parts of Judaea."<sup>1</sup>

[438 (iv)] Whether this is a conflation or not, this Isaiah-passage affords an explanation of the variations between Mark and Matthew, on the supposition that the original contained the words of Isaiah, "beyond Jordan the region of the nations." Mark may have taken this as meaning "the parts beyond Jordan and the region of the people [of God]," i.e. of Judaea. Matthew, conflating, may have taken "region of the nations" to mean, in one clause, "Galilee," in the other, "region of Judaea."

[438 (v)] As for Luke—if we are to discuss his possible parallelism—we have to bear in mind (117) that, like the author of Esdras, he never uses the ambiguous phrase "beyond Jordan." In Isaiah's prophecy, he may have interpreted the phrase as referring to the *western* side of

<sup>1</sup> Is. ix. 1, B<sup>7</sup>NAQ add τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας. The sing. "nation" is not often applied to Israel, and the pl. never, so that it is difficult to suppose that "the district of the nations" was taken to mean "the region of the people [of Israel]," i.e. *Judaea*, and conflated. But it is also difficult to suppose that so many good MSS. added the clause for the mere purpose of amplifying the prophecy, without any justification, or appearance of justification, in the text.

Jordan, so that the words meant "by the way of the [Mediterranean] sea, to the west of Jordan, Galilee of the nations"<sup>1</sup>—in effect, simply, the whole of Galilee up to Tyre and Sidon. The conflicting versions of Mark's obscure tradition might be taken by Luke as signifying that Jesus, in His final journey, ministered to "Galilee of the nations and to the people that walked in darkness." But whom could he regard as designated by the latter title more suitably than the Samaritans? Matthew's version of the Mission of the Twelve forbade the disciples to go "into the way of the nations" or enter "into any city of the Samaritans." Luke, who mentions the latter more frequently and more favourably than Matthew, might be ready to adopt a version of Isaiah's prophecy that described Jesus as journeying, towards the end of His course, among Galilaean and Samaritan.<sup>2</sup> This, however, is conjectural.

<sup>1</sup> Luke never follows Mk. in calling the sea of Galilee "sea." In Lk. it is always "lake." Mt. says that Jesus (iv. 13-15) "came and dwelt in Capernaum which-is-by-the-sea (τὴν παραθαλασσίαν) . . . that it might be fulfilled . . . 'the way of the sea beyond Jordan.'" Lk., without quoting the prophecy, implies it when he includes among the people that came to Jesus the inhabitants of (Lk. vi. 17) "the sea coast (τῆς παραλίου) of Tyre and Sidon." Apparently, Luke would not have admitted that "Capernaum" fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy; but Tyre and Sidon did. The former was merely "the way of the lake"; the latter, "the way of the sea."

<sup>2</sup> [438 (v) a] SS has "passed between the Samaritans and the Galilaean." Could an original "between (בין)" be confused with "sons of (בני)" so as to produce "between the sons of Samaria" (i.e. between the Samaritans) as a conflation? Luke's words have caused scribes and commentators great difficulty, and it seems strange that he should have used the ambiguous διὰ μέσον (or μέσου) when μεταξὺ was open to him (Mt. xxiii. 35, Lk. xi. 51). Possibly Luke may have conflated "boundaries" as "(a<sub>1</sub>) boundaries of (a<sub>2</sub>) Galilee," and then may have inferred that it meant the southern boundary of Galilee, i.e. the borders of Galilee and Samaria. In any case the mention of Samaria suited his purpose, which was to introduce a story about ten lepers, nine of them Jews, one a Samaritan.

[438 (v) b] If Lk. xvii. 11 is parallel to Mk. x. 1, then the "going to Jerusalem" may be an inferential paraphrase of Mk.'s "arising (ἀναστῆναι)," which (in O.T.) often implies a journey of some length. Mk.'s word might indeed possibly represent "went up (ἦλθεν) [to Jerusalem]," but ἀναστῆναι does not represent ἦλθεν more than four times in LXX.

[438 (v) c] "It came to pass . . . when he had finished . . ." is a form five



But it is something more than conjecture that the same Hebrew is latent under Mark's "boundaries" and Matthew's "Galilee."

§ 47. (Mk.) "*with-lowring-countenance*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*heard*"

Mk. x. 22.	Mt. xix. 22.	Lk. xviii. 23.
"But he with-lowring-countenance at the saying went-away sorrowing."	"But the young man <i>having heard</i> the [or, this] saying went-away sorrowing."	"But he, <i>having heard</i> these things, became full-of-sorrow."

(i) *Rarity of Mark's word*

[439] Mark's word may mean "*became-gloomy*," or "*became-lowring*." It is rendered by the latter word on the only other occasion where it (possibly) occurs in the New Testament, where the context ("*red* and lowring") hardly allows the former rendering. In the Septuagint it occurs twice or thrice in Ezekiel to describe the "dismay" of the nations over the fall of Tyre and Egypt. The

times repeated by Mt. in order to introduce, or close, an epoch in Christ's work (Mt. vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1). Lk. probably retains the Hebrew "it came to pass" for the same reason—namely, to mark a new departure. Mk. might naturally omit it (as it is frequently omitted by the LXX in free translation) just as he omits the Hebraic "behold" in narrative where Mt. and Lk. retain it. If Lk. is here parallel to Mk. and Mt., this is the only passage where Mt.-Lk. may be said to "agree" in retaining *ἐγένετο* against Mk.

[438 (v) d] "*It came to pass when Jesus had finished these words*, the multitudes were astonished," in Mt. vii. 28, may be regarded as either closing the Sermon on the Mount, the epoch of words, or as introducing the epoch of healing, an instance of which follows immediately. The words are omitted by Mk.-Lk. before their parallel statement about the "astonishment" of the people (Mk. i. 22, Lk. iv. 32). Compare the close of the first book of Samuel "And they took their bones and buried them . . . and fasted seven days." Here the LXX inserts (but A omits) "And it came to pass after Saul had died . . . two days"—the sentence that opens the second book. So in 1 K. viii. 1, the LXX (but not A) inserts "and it came to pass when he had-wholly-finished (*συνετέλεσεν*)"—an interpolation from 1 K. ix. 10. It is reasonable to infer that this Matthaean connecting formula, or refrain, was not a part of the original Gospel in every passage, and perhaps not in any passage, where it occurs.



adjectival form of the word—besides occurring once in Wisdom to denote the “horrible night” of the Egyptian darkness, where it has no Hebrew equivalent—occurs once in Daniel, where it means “angry,” and once in Isaiah.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) *Its use in Isaiah*

[440] The last instance is important enough to be quoted at full length:—“For the iniquity of his *covetousness* was I wroth and smote him: I hid me and was wroth, and he went [on] *frowardly* [lit. turning away] in the ways of his heart.”<sup>2</sup> But the LXX, instead of (the 2nd) “I was wroth,” gives “*he was annoyed*,” the word used here by the three Synoptists.<sup>3</sup> Also, instead of “frowardly,” it has *the adjective* “*lowring*,” *the word used here by Mark*. Again, by omitting “of his heart,” it gives the reader the option of supposing that the covetous man *went his way literally*, as Mark says here, whereas Luke makes no mention of a literal departure.

Isaiah’s mention of “covetousness,” and the assumption throughout the context that God loved the offender, make

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xvi. 3 “lowring,” *πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός*: W. and H. bracket the whole passage. “Dismay,” &c. = *עצב* in Ezek. xxvii. 35, xxviii. 19 (A) but B *στενάζουσιν*, xxxii. 10. *Στυγνός* is in Wisd. xvii. 5; Dan. ii. 12 “angry” (*עצב*) = LXX *στυγνός*, Theod. *ἐν θυμῷ*.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Is. lvii. 17 *δι’ ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα αὐτόν* [*i.e.* “I annoyed him”—in the old sense of “annoy”—instead of “I *was* annoyed” (*ἠνέσχε*)] *καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλυπήθη* [*i.e.* “and he was annoyed,” instead of “I was annoyed”], *καὶ ἐπορεύθη στυγνός* [*i.e.* “lowring” or “gloomy,” *שׁוֹכַח*, *i.e.* “turning away,” “rebellious”], *ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ* [*i.e.* “in his ways,” instead of “in the ways of his heart,” possibly because “my, his, your, heart” often means “myself, himself, yourself,” so that the LXX took the meaning to be “his own ways”]. In LXX, *λυπεῖν* means mostly “annoy,” in N.T. “grieve.” The passage appears to describe the temporary chastisements of Israel with allusion to the chastenings of “covetous” Jacob. It might well apply to the typical case of a Jewish convert, at first “rebellious” or “froward” (afterwards, possibly, repentant and a follower of Christ).

<sup>3</sup> The Heb. *עָצַב* = “wrath,” the Gk. *λυπεῖν* means in LXX “annoy,” in N.T. “grieve” (see last note). The LXX might be misunderstood by Christian evangelists.

the passage appropriate for an early Evangelist describing a man whom Jesus "loved," but who, for a time at all events, "went his way *with-lowering-countenance*" because "he had great possessions."

(iii) *The original "frowardly" caused Synoptic divergences*

[441] The Hebrew word (שׁוֹבֵב) above rendered "froward" occurs only six times in the Bible, and is *five times mistranslated by the LXX*: (a) "returning," (b) "rejected" (R.V. (a) and (b) "backsliding"), (c) "so as to turn away" (R.V.) "to the rebellious he divideth," (d) "reckless audacity" (R.V. "backsliding"), (e) (the Isaiah passage) "lowering, or, with *lowering countenance*."<sup>1</sup> On the supposition that the Original Gospel was influenced by the passage above quoted from Isaiah, marginal alterations would be suggested for so rare and obscure a word. Among these, the word "hear," though not very similar, may have been adopted by the Corrector, whom Matthew and Luke followed.<sup>2</sup> Or else, when the difficult word was dropped, the participle "hearing" may have been inserted for smoothness of connection.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> (a) Jer. iii. 22 ἐπιστρέφοντες, (b) Jer. xxxi. 22 ἡτιμωμένη, (c) Mic. ii. 4 τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι, (d) Jer. xlix. 4 ἰταμία. The word is obscure because it means "turning," so that—apart from context and vowel-points—it might just as well mean "convert" as "pervert." The same letters שׁוֹב are regarded as Pil. and Pul. of שׁוֹב, and as meaning "convert" in Is. xlix. 5, but "pervert" in Is. xlvii. 10. But the five instances given above are placed by Mandelkern under the heading "aversus," "rebellis," "desertor."

<sup>2</sup> "Froward" (στρυγνός) = שׁוֹב, "hear" = שָׁמַע; but שׁ and ב are constantly interchanged. In Ezek. xxvii. 35, xxviii. 19, xxxii. 10, στρυγνάζειν = שָׁמַע. Is. lix. 16 "he wondered" (שָׁמַע) was probably taken by LXX as "heard," i.e. perceived, κατενόησαν: Is. xliii. 12, "caused them to hear," was probably taken by LXX as "caused them to be astonished" (leg. שָׁמַע), "put them to shame," ὠνειδισα.

<sup>3</sup> [441a] Comp. 2 K. xix. 9 (lit.) "And he heard say . . . 'He is come out to fight against thee.' And he sent messengers . . .," with the parall. Is. xxxvii. 9 "And he heard say . . . 'He is come out to fight against thee.' And *when he heard it*, he sent messengers . . ." The insertion of this participle is so natural

(iv) "*went away*," why omitted by Luke?

[442] On this point it has been shewn that the Hebrew of Isaiah "*went . . . in the ways of his heart*" might justify Luke in taking "*went*" metaphorically, while the Septuagint, omitting "*of his heart*," might mislead Mark into supposing that there was *a literal departure*. But apart from these facts, special to the Isaiah-passage, the Greek "*go*," in translations from Hebrew, may always conceal the meaning of "*go on*," i.e. "*increase*." Compare:—

Jonah i. 11, 13 "*The sea grew more and more tempestuous*," LXX "*the sea went* (ἐπορεύετο), and raised up waves more."

Prov. iv. 18 "*Shineth more and more*," LXX "*they go forward* (προπορεύονται) and shine."

It is therefore by no means improbable that the Original Gospel terminated the story of the Rich Ruler by saying that "*he went on and rebelled* (i.e. *increased* in rebellion) more and more," without mentioning his *departure* from the presence of Jesus. If so, Luke (in his "*full of*") has preserved a trace of the original meaning of "*going on*," or "*increasing*," while Mark suggests a trace of the original "*rebellious*," or "*frowardness*."

§ 48. (Mk.) "*astonished*," (Mt.—Lk.) "*heard*"

The view taken in the last section (441) that Mark interpreted as meaning "*with lowering countenance*" some word that Matthew and Luke interpreted as "*heard*" is confirmed by a passage that may come conveniently here, a little out of order:

that it would require little comment but for the omission of Mk.'s rare word. It is this omission that makes substitution more probable than insertion. Perhaps the substitution passed through two stages; first, שָׁמַע was altered to שָׁמַח, and then שָׁמַח to שָׁמַע.



Mk. x. 26.	Mt. xix. 25.	Lk. xviii. 26.
"But they were above measure astonished, saying."	"But having <i>heard</i> it the disciples were exceedingly astonished, saying."	"But they that <i>heard</i> it said."

[443] The Original was probably ( $a_1$ ) "they were astonished with astonishment," liable to be confused with ( $a_2$ ) "hearing they heard." Mark took it as  $a_1$ , Luke as  $a_2$ : but Luke rejected the Hebrew reduplication, as the Septuagint often does.

Matthew conflated  $a_1$  with half of  $a_2$ . Perhaps the other half of  $a_2$  is latent in "the disciples," i.e. "his hearers."

§ 49. (*Mk.*) "*cleft*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*hole*"

Mk. x. 25.	Mt. xix. 24.	Lk. xviii. 25.
"(lit.) go-through through the cleft of a needle."	"go- <i>in</i> through the <i>hole</i> of a needle."	"go- <i>in</i> through the <i>hole</i> of a needle."

[444 (i)] SS has, both in Mark and Matthew, "enter *into* the hole of a needle."<sup>1</sup> A reasonable explanation of this, as well as of Matthew's and Luke's agreement against Mark, is to be found in the ambiguous Hebrew preposition "into," or "in," which is regularly used to mean "through" after verbs of motion.<sup>2</sup> Hence it is sometimes impossible to

<sup>1</sup> [444 (i)  $\alpha$ ] It is possible that, in this and other cases, SS may have been influenced by Syriac or Aramaic translations. In this or that particular instance, Syriac may present the same ambiguity as Hebrew. In every such case the evidence of SS in favour of a Hebrew original is diminished. The present treatise merely indicates such explanations as may be based on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original, leaving it to others to determine whether in occasional instances an Aramaic original may better explain the phenomena.

<sup>2</sup> [444 (i)  $\delta$ ] Thus the preposition  $\text{כִּי}$  is used Gen. xii. 6 with "pass ( $\text{עָבַר}$ )," xiii. 17 with "walk ( $\text{הָלַךְ}$ )," 2 S. xxiv. 2 with "go-to-and-fro ( $\text{שָׁט}$ )," Mic. ii. 13 with "go-out ( $\text{צָא}$ )." Numb. xxxi. 23 (R.V.) "everything that may *abide the fire*" is lit. "go ( $\text{בָּוֵא}$ ) *in* ( $\text{כִּי}$ ) the fire," LXX "everything that shall go-through ( $\text{διελεύσεται}$ ) *in* ( $\text{ἐν}$ ) the fire."



tell whether a Hebrew phrase means "walk *in*" (*i.e.* up and down in) or "walk *through*," or "walk *into*." Hence arise confusions in the LXX. The Hebrew "put it not *in* water" is rendered "it shall not *pass-through in* water"; "nor shall the Arabian pitch tent *there*" is rendered "nor shall Arabians *go-through* it," but by the Codex Sinaiticus "*go-in into* it."<sup>1</sup> And in a Maccabean allusion to the words of Isaiah (xliii. 2) about "walking in fire" (R.V. "walking *through*") the same Codex has "*go-in* through fire," where the others have "*go-through* through fire"—an exact parallelism to the present Synoptic difference.<sup>2</sup> It is quite possible that the original was (as in SS) "go *into* the hole." Mark, influenced by the thought of passing *through* the "strait gate" into the Kingdom, may have adopted the rendering "go-through." The Corrector may have partially, SS wholly, returned to the original.

[444 (ii)] Mark's word is rendered "cleft"<sup>3</sup> above, because it is always connected by the Septuagint with "rocks." It was probably avoided by some as a vulgar word. The Codex Alexandrinus thrice corrects it in the Septuagint, and Matthew and Luke adopt a correction of it here.<sup>4</sup>

§ 50. (*Mk.*) "a hundred-fold," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "manifest"

Mk. x. 30.	Mt. xix. 29.	Lk. xviii. 30.
"receive a hundredfold now in this time ( <i>καιρῷ</i> ) . . ."	"receive (W. & H.) <i>manifest</i> ," (D, "a hundredfold"),	"receive <i>manifest</i> (D, "sevenfold") in this time ( <i>καιρῷ</i> ),

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xiii. 1 "put it not in water," ἐν ὕδατι οὐ διελεύσεται; Is. xiii. 20 "pitch tent there," διέλθωσιν (κ εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς) αὐτήν (LXX leg. ἤν by error for ἡν).

<sup>2</sup> 4 Mac. xviii. 14 διὰ πυρὸς διέλθης (κ\* εἰσέλθης), referring to Is. xliii. 2 ἐὰν διέλθης διὰ (Heb. בַּבַּיִת) πυρὸς.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. x. 25 τρυμαλιᾶς; Mt. xix. 24, Lk. xviii. 25 τρήματος. Τρυμαλιᾶ occurs six times in LXX. Codex A alters it thrice (Judg. vi. 2, xv. 8, xv. 11). If the original was from τρι or ρρι, the former=(Tromm.) (4) τιτράω, (2) τρυπᾶω, the latter (ρρι)=(2) τρυμαλιᾶ. Τρήμα does not occur in LXX. "Needle"=(Mk.-Mt.) ραφίς, a word condemned by Phrynichus, (Lk.) βελόνη.

<sup>4</sup> See Albertus' note on Hesych. τρυμαλιᾶ, "Mox inde Venus τρυμαλιτῆς dicta."

with persecutions, and shall inherit and, in the age to  
and, in the age to eternal life." come, eternal life."  
come, eternal life."

(i) (*Mk.*) "*a hundredfold*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*manifold*"

[445] "A hundredfold" may have been altered to "manifold," partly owing to various readings (since the word is liable to corruption and is very frequently mistranslated by the LXX in proportion to the instances of its occurrence)<sup>1</sup>; partly to give what appeared to be the *real* meaning, as distinct from the literal meaning which some might press (as very ancient Christian tradition is known to have pressed the literal meaning of a hundred, sixty, and thirty, in the Parable of the Sower).<sup>2</sup>

(ii) *Signs of mistranslation in the context*

Mk. x. 29.

Mt. xix. 29.

Lk. xviii. 29.

"For the sake of  
me and for the sake  
of the Gospel."

"For the sake of  
my name."

"For the sake of  
the kingdom of  
God."

[446] The Original appears to have mentioned "giving up for the sake of *the* NAME (שם)" (272). The italicized

<sup>1</sup> [445a] "A hundred" = also "a hundred times" = מאד or מאד: "much," "exceedingly," = מאד. "A hundred" occurs only twice in Ecclesiastes and is once mistranslated; only once in Proverbs, and is there mistranslated. "A hundredth part" occurs only once in the Bible, and is mistranslated. Compare Eccles. viii. 12 "a hundred times (מאד)" ἀπὸ τότε (leg. מאד): Prov. xvii. 10, "a hundred (מאד)," οὐκ αἰσθάνεται, probably blending the word with the following κα: Nehem. v. 11 "also the-hundredth-[part]-of (מאד) the money, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργυρίου, i.e. "some of the money."

In the only passages where "a hundred-fold" is correctly translated in the Bible, the Hebrew adds the noun "times," 2 S. xxiv. 3, parallel to 1 Chr. xxi. 3, עשרים מאד (S) ἑκατονταπλασίονα, (Chr.) ἑκατονταπλασίως.

The Greek "oftentimes (πολλάκις)" does not occur in the Hebrew LXX except (2) in Job as a corruption. Πλεονάκις occurs in that sense thrice: but in two of these instances, Ps. cxxix. 1, 2 (bis) "many a time (רבה)," R.V. marg. has "much."

<sup>2</sup> Iren. v. 36. 2. See also Iren. v. 33. 2.

words were taken by Matthew as "*my name* (שמי); by Luke as "*heaven* (שמים)," which he paraphrased as "the kingdom of God." Mark, instead of "*heaven* (שמים)," read a compound of the causative of שמע "proclaim (the Gospel)" and conflated this with the tradition adopted by Matthew (only rendering "*my name*" as "*me*" in accordance with Greek idiom): "( $a_1$ ) For the sake of *me*, and ( $a_2$ ) for the sake of *the Gospel*." In New Hebrew, "name" is sometimes represented by שמה, and "heaven" in Daniel is frequently שמיא, so that the two could easily be confused.<sup>1</sup>

(i) "*in [due] time,*" confused with "*now*"

[447 (i)] Mark has "a hundredfold ( $a_1$ ) *now*, ( $a_2$ ) *in this time* (καρπῶ), houses, and brethren, . . . ( $a_3$ ) *with persecutions*, and ( $a_4$ ) *in the age that is to come*, life eternal." Luke omits  $a_1$ ,  $a_3$ , and also the explanatory list ("houses, etc."). Matthew omits these, and also  $a_2$  and  $a_4$ .

The Original probably had, not "*in this time*," but either "*in time*," meaning "*in [due] time*," בעת, or, still more probably, "*in its time*," which would be בעתו. This would accord with expressions in the Epistles, which say that "we shall reap *in its* (ἰδίῳ) *time*," or "be exalted *in [due] time*."<sup>2</sup>

But the noun "time (עת)," in a longer adverbial form (עתה), means "*now*." In two passages of O.T. the written text uses the shorter form instead of the longer to mean "*now*," and in other passages the LXX has confused the two, substituting "*now*" for "*time*." The particular phrase "*in its time*," being somewhat rare in the Bible, is especially liable to corruption, so that scribes might take it as meaning

<sup>1</sup> Schöttg. i. 410 quotes שמי שמים as meaning "to the glory of God." This phrase is not so probable here as the simple שם, NAME: but it suggests possibilities of confusion by dropping one of the two consecutive syllables, שם.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. vi. 9 "in its time (καρπῶ ἰδίῳ)," 1 Pet. v. 6 "in [due] time (ἐν καρπῶ)," where A adds "of visitation," so as to define what seemed to the scribe to be undefined.



( $a_1$ ) "now," or ( $a_2$ ) "in this time," or (as occurs sometimes in O.T., and apparently here in Matthew) they might omit it as being, if not corrupt, almost superfluous.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) "*in [due] time*," or, "*in its time*," other confusions arising from

[447 (ii)] The Original appears to have said simply, "He shall receive a hundredfold *in its time* (or, *in time*) *even* ( $\neg$ , *i.e.* and) eternal life," no mention being made of "the age to come"—the omission of which by Matthew (if it had been a part of the Original Gospel) would have been extremely difficult to explain.

It would be a very natural error (237) to mistake the Hebrew *vaw* meaning "even" for *vaw* meaning "and": thus making the sentence "He shall receive a hundredfold in [its] time and eternal life." Matthew, who departs least from this, has "He shall receive a hundredfold, *and* eternal life he shall *inherit*," perhaps implying "in [its] time" in "inherit." Mark, having above taken "in [its] time" to mean "in *this* time," now takes "and" to imply "and in *future* time," as opposed to "in *this* time"; and accordingly he inserts "in the age to come," and Luke follows him.

(iii) "*with persecutions*"

[447 (iii)] Mark's "with persecutions" makes excellent sense, and no motive can be assigned for the omission of it

<sup>1</sup> [447 (i)  $a$ ] In Ezek. xxiii. 43, Ps. lxxiv. 6 the written Hebrew text has  $\text{עַתָּה}$ , "time," for  $\text{עַתָּה}$ , "now" (LXX confused in both cases). In Eccles. x. 17 "in [due] time ( $\text{בְּעֵת}$ )" is rendered  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\nu$ , "for a time," erroneously. On the other hand, in Sir. vi. 8 "there is one that loves *for a time* ( $\text{כְּפִי עֵת}$ )" where the LXX should have  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\nu$ , it has  $\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , "in his time." 2 K. v. 26 "Is it a time ( $\text{הֲעַתָּה}$ )" is rendered "now" (leg.  $\text{עַתָּה}$ ). "In its time ( $\text{בְּעֵתוֹ}$ )" is omitted by the LXX in Ezek. xxxiv. 26 and connected with what follows (instead of, as the sense demands, with what precedes) in Jerem. v. 24.

Possibly (447 (ii)) Mt. does not wholly omit "in its time," but implies it in "inherit," *i.e.* "receive in succession, or, *in due time*."



except the belief that it was corrupt. In Ben Sira, xxxv. 20, "like *time* (נעת)" is rendered by the LXX "like clouds," and is regarded by the Cambridge Editors as a corruption for נעננ, or נעב, or נעתר. Conversely, here, it would be easy to suppose that the difficulty of בעתו had originated, among other glosses, בעני or בענת, meaning "in, or with, affliction," which might be paraphrased by Mark as "persecutions."<sup>1</sup>

(iv) (*Mk.-Mt.*) "*all-things*," (*Lk.*) "*our own*"

Mk. x. 28.

"Behold, we have left all-things."

Mt. xix. 27.

"Behold, we have left all-things."

Lk. xviii. 28.

"Behold, we, having left our-own (τὰ ἴδια)."

[447 (iv)] The Original was probably, "We have left *our-home*," i.e., in Hebrew, "*our house*." The Hebrew "house" is twice expressed in Esther by Luke's equivalent ("his *own*"), and once by "*all things*." In one of these

<sup>1</sup> [447 (iii) a] The only other passage where "persecution (διωγμός)" occurs in the Synoptists is :—

Mk. iv. 17.

"And they have no root in themselves, but (ἀλλὰ) they are for-a-time (προσκαιροί) : [Then, when there befalls tribulation or *persecution* for the word, they straightway stumble]."

Mt. xiii. 21.

"But he hath no root in himself, but (ἀλλὰ) he is for-a-time (προσκαιρός) : [but (δέ) when there befalls tribulation or *persecution* for the word he straightway stumbleth]."

Lk. viii. 13.

"But these have no root, who, for (πρός) a time (καιρόν), [believe and in time of temptation they fall away]."

The sudden and complete deviation of Lk. from Mk.-Mt. suggests that the Original Hebrew ended at "for a time," being to this effect, "But there is no root in these, but [they are] for a time." The incompleteness of this sentence caused early Editors to supply variously what seemed to be needed for completion, namely, in some form or other, "then they perish." Two of these supplements have been preserved, severally, by Mk.-Mt. and by Lk.

Lk.'s supplement repeats the word "time" ("in time of temptation"), and suggests that, among a multitude of variants, one took "for a time" to mean "in [course of] time."

three instances, where one version of Esther has "to his house," another has "to his own."<sup>1</sup>

This explains why, in recording Christ's reply, the Evangelists so seriously differ, Luke mentioning "wife"—as one of the household to be abandoned—but omitting "fields," while the earlier Evangelists make no mention of "wife." The fact probably was that Jesus mentioned nothing but "house" (*i.e.* "home," or "household"), and the Evangelists gave variously what seemed to them the meaning of "house."<sup>2</sup>

§ 50 (a). (Mk.) "*after three days*," (Mt.—Lk.) "*on the third day*"

Mk. x. 34.

Mt. xx. 19.

Lk. xviii. 33.

"after three days arise."	"on the third day be raised" (W. H. marg. "arise").	"on the third day arise."
------------------------------	---	------------------------------

See 418 and 227, where the same agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark is discussed.

§ 51. (Mk.) "*it was Jesus*," (Mt.—Lk.) "*Jesus was going, or passing, by*"

Mk. x. 46, 47.

Mt. xx. 30.

Lk. xviii. 35–37.

"the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, sat	"and behold two blind [men] sitting by the way, hearing	"a certain blind man sat by the way begging, and having
--	---	---

<sup>1</sup> Esth. viii. 2 "Over the house of (בית) H.," ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν Ἀ. In Esth. v. 10 and vi. 12, "to his house," εἰς τὰ ἴδια is the rendering in Swete and in Lagarde's version (β) : but εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ in Lagarde's version (α) of v. 10.

<sup>2</sup> [447 (iv) a] Bearing on Lk.'s mention of "wife" (placed by him immediately after "house") may be quoted Lev. xvi. 17 "for himself and for his household, lit. his house," concerning which Levy quotes Jom. 2<sup>a</sup> "That means his wife," adding several instances in which "house" was thus used, e.g. "the high priest is to have one house not two houses."

by the way, and hearing that it was Jesus ing-*by* (παράγει)." heard a crowd passing along he inquired what it was. But they told him that Jesus of Nazareth was coming-*by* (παρέρχεται)."

[448] Mark's words, strictly speaking, require a preceding question: "He asked who it was, and heard that *it was Jesus*." Otherwise, they need to be corrected thus: "that *Jesus was passing by*." This is a very obvious correction, and may have been adopted by Matthew and Luke, independently of the Corrector.

At the same time, the Original may have afforded some justification for the altering of "it was" into "passing by," or *vice versa*.

<sup>1</sup> [448a] The Hebrew for "it" in "who [is] it," would be הוּא: and this might be confused with בוא, "come." Compare Dan. xi. 10, LXX (εἰσελεύσεται) κατ' αὐτήν, Theod. (ἐλεύσεται) ἐρχόμενος (בוא). This confusion is more probable than that Mark should mistranslate הָלַךְ by εἶναι, though that mistranslation occurs (5) in LXX (see Tromm.). But Mark may have paraphrased as LXX seems to have done in Jer. ix. 10 "so that none *passeth through* (עבר)," LXX παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀνθρώπους, rendered in Jer. ix. 12 παρὰ τὸ μὴ διδοῦσθαι αὐτήν.

[448b] It may be worth mentioning that Luke's insertion about "inquiring" is probably not without supposed basis in the Hebrew text. The word that Luke uses for "beg" occurs only once in the LXX (Ps. cix. 10) where it represents בָּקַשׁ. But בָּקַשׁ, though meaning "beg" two or three times, means "ask" much more often.

Employing this ambiguous word, the Hebrew Original would lead translators from the first to query the meaning thus in the margin: "A blind man sat by the way, and he begged [*and he asked*] and he heard that it was Jesus." It was very natural first to conflate this into "he begged and he asked," and then to insert *what* he "asked." Luke's peculiar word "inquired" (πυνθάνεσθαι) is found in the LXX, thrice=שָׁאַל, once (1 Esdr. vi. 11)=בָּקַשׁ, but elsewhere (10 or 11) in non-Heb. LXX, or in LXX insertions, or various readings.

[448c] Matthew—perhaps perplexed by the variety of traditions—omits both "asking" and "begging." He also perhaps (68) took an original "Bartimaeus, even the son of" to be "Bartimaeus and the son of," thus making "two" blind men. But "two" (שְׁנֵי) may have arisen from a conflate of "sitting" (יָסַב).

[448d] It was said in *Clue* (68) that the original gloss might be "Timaeus the son of Timaeus." But this was not intended to imply that a son was called after



§ 52. (*Mk.*) "bring," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "lead"

<i>Mk.</i> xi. 2, 7.	<i>Mt.</i> xxi. 2, 7.	<i>Lk.</i> xix. 30, 35.
"Loose him [the colt] and bring [him] . . . they bring the colt . . ."	"Having loosed <i>lead</i> [them] to me . . . they <i>led</i> the ass and the colt . . ."	"Having loosed <i>lead</i> him [the colt] . . . they <i>led</i> him . . ."

[449] The Greek word here rendered "bring" means also "carry," and would not often be applied to persons, unless helpless as in the case of the paralytic (*Mk.* ii. 3).

his father's name except in very rare and special circumstances, e.g. the case of a Levirate marriage (see *Hor. Hebr.* on *Lk.* i. 59). Conybeare and Howson (*St. Paul*, vol. i. p. 45) say "It was not unusual, on the one hand, to call a Jewish child after the name of the father." If so, as there are several hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Biblical names of fathers and sons, it ought to be easy to adduce a score or two of sons thus named. But Dr. Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 157, n. 3)—while referring to, but not quoting, Delitzsch—alleges no instance from the Bible, and only two from Josephus. The allegations from Josephus ignore the fact that a son, when apparently called by a father's name, *may really be called after an ancestor*. Thus, in the pedigree of Josephus (*Life* § 1), whose father was called Matthias, the historian's brother Matthias was probably named after an earlier Matthias (or two of that name) mentioned in the pedigree. [It may be worth noting that Josephus, immediately after mentioning his brother Matthias, adds (*Life* § 2) "he was my true (γνήσιος) brother by both parents."] The historian himself was probably named after his grandfather Joseph. The same argument might apply to the high-priest the son of Ananus (*Joseph. Ant.* xx. 9. 1) "who *also was himself called Ananus*." Ananias and kindred names are frequent in post-exilic lists. The only Biblical similarity to which *Hor. Hebr.* calls attention is (1 Chr. xxiii. 21-23) Mahli the son of Mushi called after the name of his uncle Mahli. So Onias (*Joseph. Ant.* xii. 5. 1, xii. 9. 7), the son of Onias, may have been called after his uncle, who was also Onias. See Gray's *Hebrew Proper Names* (pp. 3 f.) where the Greek custom (also a Phœnician one) of naming the (? eldest) son from the grandfather is shewn to have prevailed in the pedigrees of Hillel, Onias, Jesus the son of Sirach, and the Asmonean family; but scarcely any instances are given of naming from the father. The isolated phenomenon, Abba bar Abba, a common name, requires investigation: but it is quite exceptional. The facts support the second of two conjectures of *Hor. Hebr.* on *Lk.* i. 78 "... It cannot be denied but that sometimes this" [*i.e.* naming the son after the father] "was done; but so very rarely that we may easily believe the reason why the friends of Zacharias would have given the child his own name was merely, either because they could by no means learn what he himself designed to call him, or else, *in honour to him, however he lay under that divine stroke at present, as to be both deaf and dumb.*"



Even in the case of the demoniac boy, where Mark and Matthew have "bring," Luke has "lead."<sup>1</sup> But Mark uses the word, as the Septuagint does, to express "cause to come," whether of persons or things, *e.g.*, "*bring* me a denarius," where Matthew and Luke have different forms of "shew."<sup>2</sup> A very good parallel to this divergence is found in a passage of Ezra, describing the "causing to come" of certain ministers. The translator of Ezra uses Mark's word "bring"; but the translator of Esdras, whose Greek is mostly less Hebraic than that of Ezra, has "send."<sup>3</sup>

This correction may be one of Greek style.

§ 53. (*Mk.*) "*went forth*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*passed the night*"

*Mk.* xi. 19.

"And (lit.) when it became late they (D and SS, he) went forth outside of the city."

*Mt.* xxi. 17.

"And he . . . came forth outside of the city to Bethany, and *passed-the-night*<sup>4</sup> there."

*Lk.* xxi. 37.

"But [during] the nights, going forth, he *passed-the-night* on the mountain called [the mount] of Olives."

[450] "Lodged," the word used by the Revised Version, does not express the meaning in modern English, unless we imply "during the *night*." The Greek word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament: but in the Septuagint it is

<sup>1</sup> *Mk.* ix. 19 (*Mt.* xvii. 17) *φέρετε* = *Lk.* ix. 41 *προσάγαγε*: *Mk.* xv. 1 *ἀπήνεγκαν* = *Mt.* xxvii. 2 *ἀπήγαγον*, *Lk.* xxiii. 1 *ἤγαγον*. This use of *φέρω* and its compounds was perhaps vernacular Greek. In Oxyr. Pap. cxix. (a boy's letter) οὐκ ἀπένηχές (*sic*) με μετὲ (*sic*) σοῦ εἰς πόλιν. (rep. οὐ θέλεις ἀπενέκκειν (*sic*) μετὲ σοῦ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρίαν) it means, "take me with you for a trip." In Fayum Pap. cxxxvi. πρὸ τοῦ τις ὑμᾶς ἐνέγκῃ, it means "carry you off." In N.T., apart from *Mk.* xv. 1, ἀποφέρω applied to persons means "carrying" (*Lk.* xvi. 22, Rev. xvii. 3, xxi. 10).

<sup>2</sup> *Mk.* xii. 15 *φέρετε*, *Mt.* xxii. 19 *ἐπιδελξατε*, *Lk.* xx. 24 *δελξατε*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ezr.* viii. 17 "*that-they-should-bring* (מביא) ministers," τοῦ ἐνέγκαι = 1 *Esd.* viii. 45 ἀποστεῖλαι.

<sup>4</sup> "Passed the night," ὑλίσθη. Throughout this section "pass-the-night" implies ἀνλζεσθαι in Greek or נל in Hebrew.

fairly frequent, and generally corresponds to a Hebrew word meaning "pass the night," which, however, the Greek translators sometimes render "sleep." In Daniel, an Aramaic word used to describe the king "*passing the night*," and connected with "fasting," is rendered by Theodotion "slept," but the Septuagint employs the word here used by Matthew and Luke.<sup>1</sup> Owing to the non-existence of this word elsewhere in the New Testament a superficial view might lead some to suppose that Luke must have borrowed it from Matthew: but, if so, why did he not borrow "Bethany," and "outside of the city"?

[451] The explanation of Matthew's and Luke's agreement against Mark, is that the Hebrew "and he passed the night (וַיָּלַךְ)" resembles the Hebrew "and-he-went (וַיֵּלֶךְ)," and the two have been confused. So in Ezra (x. 6), "and [when] he *came*," the Revised margin gives "and he *lodged*," and the parallel Esdras (ix. 2) has the very word used here by Matthew and Luke. The same confusion occurs in at least two other passages of the Septuagint.<sup>2</sup>

[452] Probably, then, there was very early variation in the Hebrew Gospel between "he *went* outside the city" and "he *passed the night* outside the city." Matthew and Luke adopted the latter tradition: but their remarkable differences

<sup>1</sup> [450a] Dan. vi. 18 "*and-passed-the-night* fasting" (וּבָנָה, from בָּנָה, lit. "and housed"), LXX ὑπλίσθη νήστis, Theod. ἐκοιμήθη ἄδειπνος (perhaps meaning "went to bed without having supped"). Comp. 2 S. xii. 16 "passed-the-night (וַיָּלַךְ), and lay (שָׁכַב)" (of David fasting), LXX ὑπλίσθη, where A prefixes ἐκοιμήθη καὶ without implying "sleep."

Instead of ἀλλίεσθαι, A substitutes (Judg. xviii. 3) κατέπαυσαν, (xix. 4) ἔπνωσαν, (xix. 20) καταλύσῃς. Apparently the scribe of A sometimes felt that ἀλλίεσθαι, like the English "lodge," was an ambiguous word.

<sup>2</sup> [451a] Job xxiv. 10 "they go-about (וַיֵּלְכּוּ)," LXX ἐκοίμisan, Jer. xxxi. 9 "I-will-cause-them-to-walk (וַיֵּלְכּוּ)" ἀλλίξων. In 1 Chron. xvii. 11 "thou must go (וַיֵּלְכּוּ)" = κοιμηθήσῃ, but the translation is probably influenced not by corruption of the Hebrew word but by the feeling that the sense demands "*sleep* with thy fathers." In Josh. viii. 13, וַיֵּלֶךְ (in the present Hebr. txt.) is probably an error for וַיָּלֶךְ: R.V. txt. has "went," but marg. "Some MSS. read *lodged*"; LXX om. the sentence.

from one another shew that here, as elsewhere, they adopted it independently.<sup>1</sup>

[453] Why does Luke omit all mention of Bethany, not only here, where Mark omits it, but above, (Mk. xi. 11) "the hour being now late, he went out *to Bethany*"? We have seen above that, in Daniel, the LXX uses ἀνλζεσθαι to express an Aramaic word meaning "pass the night." This word may be transliterated as *Bth*. Did Luke regard "Bethany" as a corruption of "*Bth*," so that Mk. xi. 11 and Mk. xi. 19 seemed to him duplicates, stating, in different words (Aramaic and Hebrew), that in the evening Jesus came out of Jerusalem to "*pass-the-night*" elsewhere?

§ 54. (Mk.) *Interrogative*, (Mt.-Lk.) *Conditional*

[454] The following instances of agreement between Matthew and Luke are slight in themselves, but for that very reason important as shewing that Luke did not borrow them from Matthew. If he had he would have assuredly borrowed more. In each case there is some obscurity or harshness in Mark, which would naturally lead an early Editor to correct Mark's text.

Mk. xi. 22, 23.

Mt. xxi. 21.

Lk. xvii. 6.

"Have ye faith in  
God, verily I say  
unto you . . ."

"Verily I say unto  
you, *if* ye have faith  
. . ."

"*If* ye have faith  
as a grain of mustard  
seed."

Mk. xi. 32.

Mt. xxi. 26.

Lk. xx. 6.

"Yet should we  
say . . . ?"

"But *if* we should  
say . . ."

"But *if* we should  
say . . ."

<sup>1</sup> [452a] The Hebrew for "outside the city" would be "outside *to the city*." Now "city (קִיָּה)" is at least seven times confused in LXX with "mountain (הַר)." Hence may have arisen a tradition that Jesus "went out *to the mountain*." Adopting this, Luke would naturally add "of olives." This view suggested that He spent the night in the open air, as on the night of the betrayal. Matthew—perhaps conflating (*a*<sub>1</sub>) "outside *of the city*" with (*a*<sub>2</sub>) "outside *to a city*," *i.e.* village—may have adopted a tradition that supplied "Bethany" (perhaps from Mk. xi. 11 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν).



In both cases Mark reflects the obscurity of Hebrew conditional or interrogative sentences, and has been accordingly corrected. See 372.

### § 55. "*Behold*" and "*behold!*"

At this point it will be convenient to group together four passages where Matthew has the exclamatory "*behold*," while Mark has "*seeing*," "*saw*," etc.<sup>1</sup>

Mk. i. 10.	Mt. iii. 16.	Lk. iii. 21.
(i) "he <i>beheld</i> the heavens rent."	"and <i>behold</i> , the heavens were opened."	"and it <i>came to pass</i> that . . . the heaven was opened."
Mk. v. 6.	Mt. viii. 29.	Lk. viii. 28.
(ii) "and <i>behold</i> - <i>ing</i> Jesus . . . and crying out."	"and <i>behold</i> , they cried out."	"and <i>beholding</i> Jesus, crying aloud."
Mk. v. 14.	Mt. viii. 34.	Lk. viii. 35.
(iii) "and they came out to <i>behold</i> ."	"and <i>behold</i> , all the city came out."	"and they came out to <i>behold</i> ."
Mk. v. 22.	Mt. ix. 18.	Lk. viii. 41.
(iv) "and <i>behold</i> - <i>ing</i> him."	" <i>behold</i> ,"	"and <i>behold</i> ,"

[455] As regards (i), some might be disposed to think that antecedent probability favoured Mark, who records the "*rending*" of the heaven as what Jesus "*saw*," and not as an actual fact. The latter view may seem a development naturally to be expected in the later evangelists. But against Mark we have to bear in mind that he *never uses* "*behold!*" in narrative, though the parallel Matthew and Luke

<sup>1</sup> As the Greek "*see*" is from the same root as the Greek "*behold*," it will be useful in this section to depart from the Revised Version by substituting "*beholding*" for "*seeing*."



often use it. Now it is extremely probable that the Hebrew Gospel *did* use "behold!" in narrative, as the Hebrew Bible does, and that Matthew and Luke would not systematically insert it, if it was not, at all events frequently, in the original. So far, therefore, the probability is against Mark.<sup>1</sup>

[456] It happens that the Greek exclamatory "behold" is very like the Greek verb "behold." And the Hebrew exclamatory "behold" is like "it came to pass." Hence the divergences in (i) could easily arise, as may be seen from a passage in Isaiah, where a Hebrew word resembling "behold!" has been conflated in Greek as ( $a_1$ ) "I beheld," ( $a_2$ ) "there became," which are exactly the three divergences above (i), in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.<sup>2</sup> In (i), on the whole, it is probable that Matthew represents the original, and Luke's support is in favour of adopting "behold!" also in (iv). But in (ii) and (iii), Luke's support turns the scale

<sup>1</sup> [455a] Several features of Mark's style indicate (456 (ii) a) that he would follow Genesis in a detail of this kind. Now the translators of the Septuagint seem, in the earlier books of the Pentateuch, to have tried as it were experiments of free rendering which were discarded by them, or by others, as the work of translation proceeded. Among these experiments is the rendering of the monotonous "and behold!" mostly used in narrative. It is capable of very different paraphrases. Gen. vi. 12 "And behold (lit.) it [*i.e.* the earth] corrupt," Gen. viii. 11 "And behold an olive leaf in its mouth," are severally rendered "and it *was* ( $\eta\gamma$ ) corrupt," "it *had* ( $\epsilon\lambda\chi\epsilon\nu$ ) (perh. = there was to it) an olive-leaf" (possibly confusing הנה "behold!" with היה "was," comp. Gen. xviii. 10 "and behold to Sarah a son," LXX "and Sarah *shall have* ( $\epsilon\lambda\chi\epsilon\iota$ ) a son." But in Gen. xv. 4, xxiv. 45, xxxviii. 29 "behold!" is rendered "straightway ( $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ )."  
It is *never again rendered "straightway" in the whole of the Bible.* But Mark, perhaps, borrowed his "straightway" from Genesis, as a rendering of "behold!" and persevered with it through the greater part of his Gospel. For another instance of experimental translation see 538.

<sup>2</sup> [456a] Is. xlii. 22, where one scribe has taken הוּא "this" for ( $a_1$ ) הָא, or הִנֵּה, "behold!" (=  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$ ), and another for ( $a_2$ ) הִיא (=  $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ ). Then  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$  has been altered to  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$ , resulting in ( $a_1$ )  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$  (ΑΓ'  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$ ) ( $a_2$ )  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ . For another instance of a confusion between  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon$  (הִנֵּה) and  $\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (הִיא) see I K. v. 6 "shall be,"  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon$  (A ins.  $\epsilon\lambda\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$ ).

[456b] The practice of spelling "they saw ( $\epsilon\lambda\delta\omicron\nu$ )" as  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$ , and of writing it as  $\epsilon\delta\omicron$ , might easily lead scribes to suppose it was an unfinished  $\epsilon\delta\omicron(v)$ . And "he saw ( $\epsilon\lambda\delta\epsilon$ )," when spelt with  $\iota$  for  $\epsilon$  (a frequent usage in the best MSS.), is identical with the imperative "see ( $\epsilon\lambda\delta\epsilon$ )" = רָא.

in favour of Mark, especially as the Greek "they saw" is very easily confused with the Greek "behold!"

§ 55 (a). (*Mk.*) "*I will put a question,*" (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*I, too, will question,*" etc.

*Mk.* xi. 29.

"But Jesus said to them, I will put-a-question-to you (lit.) one word, and answer me and I will say (ἐρῶ) to you by what authority I do these things."

*Mt.* xxi. 24.

"[But, bracketed by W. H.] Jesus *answering* said to them, *I too* (καὶ γώ) will (om. *put*) question you (lit.) one word which if ye *say* (εἰπητε) to me I too will say to you by what authority I do these things."

*Lk.* xx. 3.

"But *answering* he said unto them, *I too* (καὶ γώ) will (om. *put*) question you (lit.) a-word and (lit.) *say* (εἶπατε) to me."

(i) *Mt.—Lk. insert "answering"*

[456 (i)] It is very rare indeed for the LXX to insert "answering" where the Hebrew has merely "said."<sup>1</sup> But it is also rare for the LXX to omit "answering" (or "answered and") as superfluous.<sup>2</sup> In view of other evidence that Mark translates freely, it is probable that Matthew and Luke are here retaining an original Hebraic "answering."

(ii) (*Mk.*) "*put-a-question,*" (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*question*"

[456 (ii)] Mark's word, in the LXX, almost always means (except in Genesis) "consult" an oracle, a prophet,

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the only two instances are Gen. xviii. 9, Dan. (LXX) vii. 16. In both, the object may be to imply that the "saying" is a "saying *in answer*."

<sup>2</sup> It is omitted in Numb. xxiii. 12, 1 Chr. xii. 17, Job iii. 2, xxxviii. 1, Dan. ii. 8 (LXX), ii. 20 (Theod.). Job, Esdras, and Daniel (LXX) sometimes express it by ὑπολαβών or ἐκφωνεῖν.

or God<sup>1</sup>; and it often means "consult" an oracle in classical Greek. It might therefore naturally be altered here by a Corrector, or by the later Evangelists independently. The short Gospel of Mark uses the word nearly as many times as the other three Gospels put together. In the LXX, "put-a-question" and "question" are frequently interchanged in various readings.

(iii) (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*I too*"

[456 (iii)] This emphatic form of "I" is used by Matthew and Luke in those portions of their Gospels which are peculiar to themselves.<sup>2</sup> It is very appropriate here in the sense "I, as well as you," or "I in turn," and might possibly be an alteration of the Corrector, for style. But more probably it is based on the Hebrew original, which might express the antithesis between "I" and "you" by inserting the Hebrew "I" as the subject of the verb. This is done sometimes for emphasis, and the LXX does not always reproduce the pronoun, as where Zedekiah says to Jeremiah "*I* [*i.e.* I, the king] will ask thee a word."<sup>3</sup> Combining this with the Hebraic "answering" above mentioned, we are led

<sup>1</sup> [456 (ii) a] Ἐπερωτᾶν, in Gen., always = (5) "question" (verb) in the ordinary sense. In the rest of the historical books (where it occurs about forty times) it = "consult" (God, a man of God, soothsayers, the fathers, etc.): Jd. viii. 14, 2 S. xi. 7, xiv. 18, 2 K. viii. 6, 1 S. xvii. 56 (A) are probably the only exceptions. This is one of the many instances in which Mark follows (455a) Genesis. "Put-a-question" is chosen as the rendering above, not because it expresses the Greek well, but because it brings out the similarity, and the difference, between Mk. and Mt.-Lk. Ἐπερωτᾶν occurs in Mk. (25), Lk. (17), Mt. (8), Jn. (2). In Mt. xii. 10, and parall. Lk. vi. 9, the question "Is it lawful?" is introduced by both writers with ἐπερωτᾶν: but Mt. represents Jesus as questioned, Lk. as questioning.

In Oxyr. Pap. vol. i., lxxxiv. 18 and 25, cxxxiii. 5, etc., the word means "formally question" in a legal sense.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. ii. 8, Lk. i. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Jer. xxxviii. 14. So in Lev. xx. 3, 5, where the express intervention of God is implied by the emphatic pronoun "*I* will set my face," the LXX inserts ἐγὼ in xx. 3, but not in xx. 5.



to think that this correction probably was due to a Hebrew Original.

(iv) *Lk.'s omission of "I will say . . ."*

[456 (iv)] This, not being an agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark, does not fall, strictly speaking, within the scope of this treatise. But, having a bearing on the three last paragraphs, it will be conveniently discussed here.

If Luke knew of the words in Mark, he must have rejected them, either as doubtful or erroneous, or else because they seemed to commit Jesus to an unconditional promise to tell His questioners what they asked, no matter what kind of answer was given by them. The former is by far the more reasonable, as well as the more charitable, explanation; and it is confirmed by the remarkable variations of Mark in D, SS, and the Arabic Diatessaron. These, instead of "And answer me," have respectively, "answer me," "*which* ye shall answer me," "*and if* ye tell me"—none of which agrees exactly with Matthew, "*which if* ye say to me." Moreover, why does Luke omit "one" (before "word"), which is inserted by Matthew as well as Mark?

Probably the Original was as in Luke and the first part of Mark, only emphasising the pronoun by inserting the Hebrew "ye" thus: "I will ask you a word: *ye* (אנח), answer-ye (imper.) me." Now this superfluous "ye" would naturally cause difficulty. By dropping א, it becomes אנ "if"; and this has actually taken place in one instance in the LXX.<sup>1</sup> So here, "if" appears to have been written in the margin for "ye," and to have been adopted as one alternative by Matthew. But now let us suppose a literal Greek rendering adopting "if (εαν)," sometimes written εἰ. It happens that this is very similar to the Greek for "one (ενα)" some-

<sup>1</sup> Josh. xxii. 18.



times written  $\epsilon\alpha$ . Hence Mark might take the words as, "I will ask you *one* word: answer me."<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand the conditional form of the tradition ("if ye answer me") would naturally lead Evangelists to supply "I also will tell you," to make the sense complete: and this more complete form might be conflated both by Mark and by Matthew with the erroneous "one." But Mark retained the old imperative ("answer"); Matthew adopted the conditional ("if ye say"); Luke went back to the brief Original.<sup>2</sup>

§ 56. (*Mk.*) "*those*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*having seen*"

Mk. xii. 7.

Mt. xxi. 38, Lk. xx. 14.

"But those husbandmen."

"But the husbandmen *having seen*."

Having ascertained (456) that the verb "behold," or "see," may be confused, by Greek corruption, with the exclamatory "behold," we have to ask whether the latter can also be confused with "those" or "these." If so, the discrepancy here is explained.

[457] The following instances will suffice:—2 Chr. viii. 9 "*they* (emphatic, i.e. *those*)," LXX "*behold*"; Josh. vii. 22 "and *behold* it was hid," LXX "and *these* were hidden"; Josh. ix. 13 "and *behold* they be rent," LXX "and *these* are rent"; 2 Chr. xxxv. 25, "and *behold* they are written," is correctly translated by the Septuagint, but the parallel 1 Esdr. i. 31 has "but *these-things* are written"; 1 S. xxvii. 8 "*those* [nations]," LXX "*behold*"; 1 K. iii. 21 "and *behold* it was dead," LXX "and *that-one* was dead"; 2 K

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew confusion might less probably convert  $\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , "ye," to  $\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , "one."

<sup>2</sup> It is conceivable that the Original contained a conditional "if" with the apodosis suppressed as in Lk. xiii. 9 "If it bear fruit," and perhaps in Mk. vii. 11 "If a man say to his father, Korban." And "if ( $\epsilon\alpha$ )" might be confused with, or dropped before,  $\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , "say" (comp. Jer. v. 2 where  $\epsilon\alpha = \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$ ). But a combination of Greek and Hebrew corruption, as above, best explains all the facts.

iv. 40 "then *they* (lit. *those*) cried out," LXX "and *behold* they cried out."<sup>1</sup>

[458] The frequency of this corruption makes it extremely probable that, in the present passage, the original was either "and *those-men*, the husbandmen," as Mark has it, or "and *behold*, the husbandmen." The former, being an unusual phrase, was probably converted into the latter; and the latter, by Greek corruption, was changed from "behold!" into "beheld." This was adopted by Matthew and Luke."<sup>2</sup>

§ 57. (*Mk.*) "*he will come*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*they say*"

Mk. xii. 9, 10.

"(a) What will the lord of the vineyard do? (b) He will come and destroy the husbandmen and give the vineyard to others. (c) Have ye not even read this Scripture . . . ?"

Mt. xxi. 40-42.

"When *therefore* the lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do *to those* husbandmen? *They say* unto him, He will miserably destroy those miserable men,<sup>3</sup> and give forth the vineyard to other husbandmen, who will render him the fruits in their season. *Jesussaith* unto *them*, Have ye not even read in the Scriptures . . . ?"

Lk. xx. 15-17.

"What *therefore* will the lord of the vineyard do *to them*? He will come and destroy these husbandmen and give the vineyard to others. But when they heard it *they said*, God forbid. But he having looked upon *them said*, What therefore is this that is written . . . ?"

<sup>1</sup> In most of these cases the error is caused by the identity (apart from vowel points) between "behold!" and "those" (fem.) (both = הנה, e.g. in 1 S. xxvii. 8. But in 2 Chr. viii. 9, and 2 K. iv. 40, *lōō* = הנה read as הנה (Chr. A. *avrot*).

<sup>2</sup> Greek corruption is here a necessary part of the hypothesis. "They saw" = ראו: "those" = הנה, and these two could not be interchanged by Hebrew corruption.

<sup>3</sup> Mt. xxi. 41 *κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει* means exactly "he will *wretchedly* destroy those *wretches*."

[459 (i)] Matthew here assigns to the chief priests an amplified version of words assigned by Mark and Luke to Jesus. Luke so far agrees with Matthew as to insert some kind of reply from the chief priests, while Mark gives none at all.

That such a divergence might arise from Hebrew may be seen from a couple of passages in Kings: "And he [*i.e.* Benhadad] said unto him, 'The cities which my father took from thy father I will restore . . . as my father made in Samaria.' 'And I' [*said Ahab*], 'will let thee go with this covenant,'" where the italicized words could not be omitted in English;<sup>1</sup> "And he [Jehu] saluted him [Jehonadab], and said to him, 'Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?' And Jehonadab answered 'It is.' [*And Jehu said*], 'If it be, give me thine hand.'" In the former case, the R.V. inserts the italicized words, but the LXX does not. In the latter, the LXX inserts them, but the R.V. does not. These and other similar passages indicate possible divergence from a Hebrew Original *omitting* a verb of speech.<sup>2</sup>

[459 (ii)] But divergence might also arise from Hebrew superfluous *insertion* of a verb of speech, for example, "And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me. *And he said*, Hear, ye peoples, all of you." The LXX omits the words, "And he said . . . you," possibly thinking that "he" must be Ahab (not Micaiah), and that this would not make sense.<sup>3</sup> (In the parallel passage in Chronicles, LXX (2 Chr. xviii. 27) inserts the utterance, but omits "and he said.") So again, where

<sup>1</sup> 1 K. xx. 34, 2 K. x. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Josh. xxiv. 22, 23 "And Joshua said unto the people, 'Ye [are] witnesses . . . that ye have chosen you the Lord to serve him.' And they said, 'We are witnesses.' 'Now therefore put away, [*said he*], the strange gods . . .'" Here the LXX omits the reply of the people so as to make Joshua's speech continuous, thus not needing to insert the words "said he," which are omitted in the Hebrew.

<sup>3</sup> 1 K. xxii. 28, A inserts the words.



Hezekiah, after speaking to Isaiah, is perhaps represented as speaking to himself: "Then said Hezekiah unto Isaiah, Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. *He said moreover*, Is it not so, if peace and truth shall be in my days?" Here the LXX omits the whole of this second utterance. In the parallel passage in Isaiah, the LXX inserts a similar utterance about "peace and truth," but omits the words "he said moreover."<sup>1</sup>

[459 (iii)] These phenomena in the LXX would lead us to expect in the Synoptic Gospels, if translated from Hebrew, cases where one Gospel inserts the superfluous "and he said," while others reject it. Accordingly, we find no less than *eight instances where Mark has this superfluous insertion* (ἐλεγεν) *while Matthew and Luke, one or both, reject it*. One of these is particularly noteworthy because it happens to resemble the utterance of the prophet Micaiah quoted above (459 (ii)). It is at the end of the Parable of the Sower where Mark has "*And he said* (καὶ ἐλεγεν), He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew omits "and he said." Luke inserts it in a form well adapted to bring out the sense of an abrupt appeal: "*Saying these things he cried aloud* (ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει), 'He that hath . . .'"<sup>2</sup>

[459 (iv)] The facts above stated show that the Synoptic

<sup>1</sup> 2 K. xx. 19 (A inserts the words in a somewhat corrupt form), parallel to Is. xxxix. 8. In Josh. iii. 9, 10 "And Joshua said unto the children of Israel, Come hither and hear the words of the Lord your God. *And Joshua said*, Hereby . . .," LXX om. the second "and Joshua said." In Dan. x. 14, the LXX inserts the words "and he said unto me," in the midst of the speech of an angel, against the Hebrew, which Theodotion follows.

<sup>2</sup> [459 (iii) α] Mk. iv. 9, Mt. xiii. 9, Lk. viii. 8. Other instances are Mk. ii. 27, iv. 21, 24, 26, 30, vi. 10, vii. 20, viii. 21, ix. 1. In all these cases (except vii. 20 ἐλεγεν δὲ) Mk. has καὶ ἐλεγεν. After Mk. ix. 1, this form occurs only five times in Mark's record of Christ's sayings, and in the five parall. passages Mt.-Lk. insert verbs of speech (Mk. ix. 31, xi. 17, xii. 35, 38, xiv. 36).

These remarks deal simply with Mk.'s use of ἐλεγεν (not εἶπεν etc.).

[459 (iii) β] Oxyr. Pap. vol. i., xxxiii. contains a report of judicial proceedings, written late in the second century, in which verbs of speech are frequently omitted, the name of the speaker being alone inserted. If such omissions were sometimes made in early notes of Christian traditions, it would tend to confusion.



divergence under discussion may easily have arisen from a Hebrew Original. The following facts show that Mark is probably closest to the Original :—

(1) Matthew and Luke, though they both insert "said," *do not insert it in the same place*. Now this is a frequent sign of interpolation. A word placed in the margin may naturally be transferred by one editor to one position in the text, by another to another a little earlier or later. And this appears to have happened here.

(2) The words, in Mark, "He will come," following "What will the lord of the vineyard do?" might be naturally taken as *an answer made by the chief priests* (although self-question followed by self-answer is characteristic of Christ's teaching). After the fall of Jerusalem, too, there would seem to the later Evangelists an appropriateness in making the Jews thus pronounce sentence on themselves.<sup>1</sup>

(v) (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*therefore . . . to those (Lk. them)*"; (*Mt.*) "*when . . . cometh,*" (*Mk.-Lk.*) "*he will come*"

[459 (v)] "Therefore" is inserted by Matthew and Luke against Mark on two other occasions where Mark is

<sup>1</sup> Another argument may perhaps be derived from an allusion, in Mk. and Mt., to Isaiah's prophecy about the vineyard of the Lord. The LXX version of that prophecy contains the words (Is. v. 2), "I set a hedge about it (*φραγμὸν περιέθηκα*) . . . and built a tower in the midst of it, and digged a wine-press (*προλήνιον*) in it." All the italicised words are exactly reproduced in Mk. xii. 1 (followed by Mt. xxi. 33), with the slight variation of *ὑπολήνιον* (Mt. *ληνὸν*) for "wine-press." Lk.'s omission of them suggests that they were not parts of the Original but a very early oral addition, or marginal gloss transferred to the text (like the Isaiah-passage about "the worm and the fire" (434a)). But there can be no doubt that the earliest Hebrew Evangelist, in writing this parable, would have in view the Song, similar in subject and similarly addressed. In the sequel of the Song, the prophet says (Is. v. 3) "And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. . . ." But, without waiting for their answer, he continues (Is. v. 5), "And now, go to, I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard." Mk. and Lk. are therefore following on the lines of the prophecy in representing the Lord Himself as "telling" what the Lord of the vineyard "will do." And there is no reason here to suspect a gloss.

extremely abrupt.<sup>1</sup> It may be regarded as a correction for smoothness (534 (ii)); and "to those," and "to them," as insertions of the object of the verb for definiteness (534 (i)).

But Matthew's "when" cannot be explained as a correction for style. This points to an original Hebrew particle (כי) of an extremely ambiguous character (Gesen. Oxf.) capable of meaning "when," or "that," or "verily," while sometimes it simply introduces a speech like inverted commas and might be left untranslated. It is therefore something more than a mere conjecture that an Original "*verily* he will come" or "*that* he will come" was taken by Matthew as "when he shall come," and transposed to the beginning of his sentence.<sup>2</sup>

(vi) (Lk.) "*looked upon them*"

[459 (vi)] It is antecedently most improbable that a serious historian like Luke would interpolate a statement of this kind for merely graphic purposes. There must have been something in the text that induced him to insert this rare word, rare in N.T. as a whole, and only twice used by Luke.<sup>3</sup> The facts previously alleged point to the conclusion that it must be a conflate of a marginal "and he said." That this is so, is rendered highly probable by the similarity in Hebrew between "and he said (וַיֹּאמֶר)" and "and he looked-on-them (וַיִּרְאֵם)." And the probability is greatly increased by the occurrence of this very conflation in Job where the Hebrew has simply "But he said to her,"

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xii. 23, Mt. xxii. 28, Lk. xx. 33; Mk. xii. 37, Mt. xxii. 45, Lk. xx. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly "therefore" was a part of the Original and dropped by Mk. who scarcely ever uses this particle (οὖν) (in W. H. only thrice, and once bracketed). The words in the vineyard-prophecy above quoted (Is. v. 5 "and now (ועתה) . . . what I will do") rather suggest (since עתה ועתה often = עַתָּה וְעַתָּה (e.g. Gen. xxi. 23, xxvii. 3, 8, 43) or οὖν (e.g. Gen. xxiv. 49, Exod. iii. 18, x. 17)) that the original here may have been "what *therefore*."

<sup>3</sup> Ἐμβλέπω occurs Mk. (4), Mt. (2), Lk. (2), Jn. (2), Acts (1). The other instance in Lk. is xxii. 61, where, as here, Lk. probably used the word to indicate divine or prophetic insight (so Jn. i. 36, 42).

but the LXX "But he, *having looked upon* [her], said to her." <sup>1</sup>

[459 (vii)] The most probable conclusion from the facts above alleged is that the Original, like Mark, contained no verb of speech before (b) and (c). Subsequently, Hebrew verbs ("and they said," "and he said") were inserted in the margin to indicate that the passage was (as the correctors thought) a dialogue and not a speech. Hence Matthew and Luke differed in the places assigned by them to the verbs of speech. Luke conflated the second verb of speech with another verb.

(i) (*Mt.*) "*miserably . . . miserable men*"

[460 (i)] Matthew's phrase, as is abundantly shown by Wetstein, is one frequent in maledictions ("wretch, may you wretchedly perish!" "may the gods, wretch, destroy you wretchedly," etc.), and it suggests a use of the Hebrew word *chrm* (חרם) translated in the LXX mostly by "utterly destroy (ἐξολοθρεύω)," but frequently by "anathematize," *i.e.* "devote to destruction." <sup>2</sup> But if this word was in the original, why was it softened down by Mark, with Luke's acquiescence, to "destroy" (ἀπόλλυμι), which is only twice used by LXX as a rendering of חרם?

We have to consider this insertion of Matthew's in the light of two facts. (1) Mark's version is deficient in anti-

<sup>1</sup> Job ii. 10 δὲ ἐμβλέψας εἶπεν αὐτῇ: "and he said" = ἔειπεν, "and he looked-on-them" = ἑώρακεν, a form used only in 2 K. ii. 24 of Elisha looking on the children whom he curses (R.V. "saw," LXX εἶδεν). Ἐμβλέπειν occurs in the hist. books of O.T. only thrice (always = ἑώρακεν). The confusion between "see" (*i.e.* "perceive") and "say" explains a confusion between the following parallel passages, (a) Mk. xii. 28 "one of the scribes . . . *knowing* (εἰδώς, D εἰδων) that he answered well," Lk. xx. 39 "some of the scribes . . . *said*, Teacher thou hast answered well"; (b) Mk. xii. 34 "And Jesus *having seen* that he answered discreetly," Lk. x. 28 "But he (*i.e.* Jesus) *said* to him, Thou hast answered rightly." The consequent confusion appears to have produced (c) Mk. xii. 32 "Well, teacher, in truth didst thou *say*."

<sup>2</sup> ὀργή = ἀναθεματίζω (13), ἐξολοθρεύω (23), ἀπόλλυμι (2).



thesis between the two classes of husbandmen, one, wicked, which is to be "destroyed," and another, which is to succeed the first. Luke inserts "these" before the former class. Matthew, with the same object, may have inserted some term signifying "accursed." (2) Later on, in describing the second class, Matthew is not content (like Mark) with "others," but adds, "husbandmen who shall give him their fruits in their seasons." Matthew's two additions, taken together, indicate an amplifying tendency in his narrative, so that we must not expect to find his additions corresponding exactly to the Hebrew Original.

But, though both Matthew's additions may have been dictated by a desire to define the meaning, their form may have been suggested by something—perhaps a play on words, perhaps a corruption—in the Hebrew text. For example—the Hebrew for "vine-dressers" being the plural of *crm* (כרם), and for "devoting-to-destruction" *chrm* (חרם)—an editor, in order to define the first class of "vine-dressers (*crm*)," may have inserted in the margin "men devoted-to-destruction," literally "men of *chrm*."<sup>1</sup> And again, the word "others," אחרים, might suggest to the editor אנכרים, which is the most frequent original of the Greek "husbandmen (γεωργοί)," and is occasionally connected with "vine-dressers."<sup>2</sup> These details are quite uncertain: but it is almost certain that Matthew's additions are glosses.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 1 K. xx. 42 "the man of (lit.) *my-devoting-to-destruction* (חרם)," *ἀνδρα δέθριον*, Is. xxxiv. 5 "the people of *my-devoting-to-destruction* (חרם)," *τὸν λαὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας* (R.V. (K.) "whom I had devoted to destruction," (Is.) "of my curse").

<sup>2</sup> מכר = ἀροστήρ (1), γεωργός (5). Γεωργός occurs in Heb. LXX only (9). Ἀμπελουργοί occurs (4), always plur., always = כרמים, which is never used apart from "husbandmen" (or "ploughmen") in the context. Even with this aid to define the meaning, כרמים, "vine-dressers," is translated κτήματα, "possessions," in Joel i. 11, being identical, without vowel points, with the pl. of "vineyard."



(ii) (*Lk.*) "God forbid," (*Mt.*) "render him the fruits . . ."

[460 (ii)] There is only one word in the Hebrew scriptures that asserts a paramount claim to represent the original of "God forbid," or (to give the Greek) of "Not [so] be it!" This therefore must be made the basis of investigation into a possible Hebrew original, or gloss, that may explain the Synoptic divergences. It occurs, sometimes reiterated, in nineteen passages, and literally means "profanation (חלילה)." Hence "profanation to me," "profanation from the Lord," "profanation from this," or sometimes simply "profanation," means "far be it that I should do this, or, that this should happen!"

But this root "profane," or "make common," when applied to a vineyard, meant to *begin to use its fruits*. For three years the fruits of a newly-planted vineyard were to remain uneaten; the fruits of the fourth year were to be consecrated to Jehovah; in the *fourth* year, said the Levitical Law, "all the fruit shall be holy for giving praise unto the Lord."<sup>1</sup> In the *fifth* year the owner might eat the fruit, and, to describe this, Jeremiah uses the word "make common," i.e. "free for all to enjoy," thus (R.V.): "The planters shall plant and *shall enjoy* [the fruit thereof]," where A.V. has "eat [them] as common things."<sup>2</sup> Here the LXX has "plant and *praise*," confusing "enjoy" with the very similar word mentioned in the Levitical passage just quoted about "giving-praise" with the fruits of the *fourth* year. "Enjoy" is from חלל, "praise" from הלל.

(iii) *Both were probably glosses*

[460 (iii)] Hitherto, we have arrived no further than this, that Matthew's and Luke's divergent insertions may

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xix. 24 "for-giving-praise (הלולים) unto (ל-) the Lord."

<sup>2</sup> Jer. xxxi. 5 "enjoy [the fruit thereof] (חלל)," *alvéssare* (leg. הלל). In this sense, "enjoy," חלל occurs elsewhere (Gesen. Oxf.) only in Deut. xx. 6 (*bis*) εὐφραίνομαι, xxviii. 30 τρυγῶ.

have arisen from some Hebrew word that might be variously interpreted (1) "profanation," (2) "enjoy the first-fruits of a vineyard" (with a possibility of a third variant "giving praise," connected by Levitical tradition with the consecration of the fourth year's fruits). And the question arises whether "profanation from the Lord, or to the Lord,"<sup>1</sup> being the original, was taken wrongly to mean "for giving praise unto the Lord"—which was paraphrased by Matthew into a materialistic statement about "rendering fruits unto the Lord of the Vineyard"—or whether some statement about "giving praise," or "enjoying first-fruits," was the original, wrongly interpreted by Luke.

Both suppositions are attended with great difficulties. If Luke's was the original, then, referring to the LXX and finding that "profanation" is never mistranslated there, we have to ask why it is apparently mistranslated here by Matthew and certainly omitted by Mark. That various editors should corrupt "profanation," first, into some word or words meaning "enjoy first-fruits" or "praise," and then that this should be loosely paraphrased by Matthew into a sentence about "rendering first-fruits in due season," seems very improbable—and all the more because Matthew himself—alone of the Evangelists—has the phrase "God forbid" elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

It seems more probable that some editor of the Hebrew Gospel, reflecting on the circumstances of the vineyard,

<sup>1</sup> The latter construction is found in Job xxxiv. 10.

<sup>2</sup> [460 (iii) a] Mt. xvi. 22 "Be it far from thee" (marg. "God have mercy on thee") *Θεός σοι, κύριε*. "*Θεός* is used thus by LXX in three passages to represent *ה'ללה* (2 S. xx. 20 twice, xxiii. 17, 1 Chr. xi. 19). In 1 S. xiv. 45 "shall Jonathan die . . . *God-forbid* (*ה'ללה*), as the Lord liveth (*יהוה חי*)," LXX om. *Θεός*, but A inserts it. Abraham (Gen. xviii. 25) uses a similar expression twice towards God, "Profanation (*ה'ללה*) to thee (*לך*) from doing . . . , profanation (*ה'ללה*) to thee (*לך*)," *μηδαμῶς σὺ ποιήσεις . . . μηδαμῶς*. In LXX, *ה'ללה* = *μὴ γένοιτο* (5), *μὴ εἴη* (2), *ἴλεως* (5), *μηδαμῶς* (9). In 1 Chr. xi. 19 "profanation to me from God (*ה'ללה*)," *Θεός μοι, ὁ Θεός* = 2 S. xxiii. 17 "profanation to me, O Lord (*יהוה*)," *Θεός μοι, Κύριε* (where Gesen. Oxf. leg. *יהוה*): both passages add "from doing this," the sentence meaning "God forbid that I should do this!"

namely, that it had been newly planted by the owner, and that the owner represented the Lord, and that the first-fruits were due by Law to Him, jotted down in the margin some of the words of the Levitical Law. This obscure allusion may have been misunderstood by Luke as being the familiar term "profanation." On this hypothesis, the glosses result from mere interpolation. But, as in the case of (106) the sons of Araunah, a gloss is often based on something in the text. The next paragraph will consider whether this may be the case here.

(iv) *Origin of the glosses*

[461] In the following words Luke deviates from Mark and Matthew, who agree in having (Mk.) "*Have ye not even read this scripture?*" (Mt.) "*Have ye not even ever read in the Scriptures?*" while Luke has "What therefore is written?"

Now this reproachful question—implying that the chief priests ought to have read, but have not—might naturally be represented by a phrase presenting a considerable similarity to "profanation." And this—especially coming in an ambiguous position, at the head of a sentence, before which some supplied, and some did not supply, a verb of speech—might give rise to the two glosses described above.<sup>1</sup>

Against the probability of the originality of Luke's "God forbid," it must be added that (i) the Arabic Diatessaron omits it (though it might easily have been combined with Matthew), (ii) the Syro-Sinaitic substitutes a part of Lk. xx. 19, "they knew that he spake this parable against

<sup>1</sup> [461a] "Have ye not even (ever) read" might represent an original "Ought ye not to have read," lit. "[Was it] not to you (הלא לכם) to read." If  $\alpha$  were read as  $\gamma$ , or dropped, the first letters would become הלל, closely resembling the root of the word "profanation" (הלל), and identical with the root of the word "praise" in the above-quoted Levitical text. For "ought ye not," see 2 Chr. xiii. 5 הלא לכם (also Nehem. v. 9, where LXX has οὐχ οὐτως).



them." (iii) Moreover, the Hebrew phrase about "profanation" might be erroneously derived from the Hebrew of Luke's following words about "this that is written."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [461*b*] "That which is written" is not always represented by the Hebrew "write." See *Hor. Hebr.* (on Lk. x. 25) about "those various treatises amongst the Rabbins; the *Micra*, *Mis(h)na*, *Midras(h)* . . . : מִקְרָא, *Micra* is the text of the Bible itself, its reading and literal explanation, *Mis(h)na* the doctrine of traditions and their explication." Consequently "What is this that is written?" might be in Hebrew, "What [is] *Micra* this?" But "what (מָה)" might be taken as "from (-ם)," followed by the article (-ה), and *Micra* (since מִקְרָא and מָה are very frequently interchanged) is capable of meaning "mischance," "misadventure." Hence the words "What is this that is written?" following after "profanation" might be taken as "Profanation *from this mischance!*" i.e. "God forbid this evil." This has been described above as "erroneously derived," because "mischance" would not be a suitable word to use (1 S. vi. 9) for a divine visitation. Still, it is possible that a glosser, endeavouring to make sense out of one among several obscure variations, might misinterpret the word thus, and that the whole might be wrongly paraphrased by Lk. in a conflation as "God forbid."

[461*c*] On the other side—and in favour of the hypothesis that Lk.'s "God forbid" represents the Original, from which Mk.-Mt. have deviated—it may be fairly urged that elsewhere the parall. Mk. omits the words of Peter (Mt. xvi. 22, Lk. om. the whole) "Be it far from thee, Lord." Does it not seem probable that Mk. erroneously omitted these words in Peter's reply? And, if he was wrong there, may he not be wrong here in making the same omission? Again, if Mk. had inserted the words here, the insertion would have been fatal to his (peculiar) view that the context contained not a dialogue but a continuous discourse. For how could Christ utter such an expression? Might not Mk., therefore, naturally—but erroneously—infer, under these circumstances, that the words were corrupt?

This argument certainly deserves consideration. But one last point must not be forgotten. It is possible that, even in Peter's reply, the words "Be it far from thee" may be a gloss. Some evangelistic scribe, wishing to indicate the reverent nature of Peter's "rebuke" to Jesus, may have inserted in the margin a quotation of the famous remonstrance, not "rebuke," addressed by Abraham to Jehovah (460 (iii) *a*). And this may have been inserted by Mt. in his text.

[461*d*] As regards Lk.'s addition "*when they heard it* (ἀκούσαντες) they said," it is natural to assume that it is added for mere connection. But consideration will shew that Lk. must have taken "hear" to mean (as it often does in N.T.) "understand." He intends to say, "*when they understood the meaning* [of the parable], they said, God forbid." Compare below Mk. xii. 28 "*knowing* (D *seeing*) (SS *hearing*) that he answered well." We have seen above that Lk.'s "*he looked upon them and said*" may have been a conflation of "he said." So here, "they said" may have been conflated by Lk.'s original as "(*a*<sub>1</sub>) they *saw* [the meaning] and (*a*<sub>2</sub>) *said*." Lk. may have expressed (*a*<sub>1</sub>) by "they heard."



[462] § 58. *The Commandment-discussion*

Mk. xii. 28 (lit.).

(a) "And having come to him, one of the scribes, (b) having heard them [*i.e.* Jesus and the Sadducees] disputing, (c<sub>1</sub>) knowing that he [had] answered them well, (d) asked him, Which commandment is first (fem.) of all [things] (neut.)?"

Mk. xii. 32.

(c<sub>2</sub>) "the scribe said to him, Teacher well saidst thou in truth."

Mk. xii. 34 (lit.).

(c<sub>3</sub>) "Jesus seeing him that he answered discreetly."

Mt. xxii. 34-36.

"But the Pharisees, having heard that he [had] muzzled the Sadducees, were gathered together; and there questioned him one of them, a *lawyer*, tempting him, *Teacher*, which commandment is great in the law?"

Lk. xx. 39.

"But some of the scribes said, (c<sub>2</sub>) Teacher, thou saidst well."

Lk. x. 25-28.

"And behold a certain *lawyer* stood up greatly - tempting him, saying, *Teacher*, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? But he said to him, *In the law* what is written? How readest thou? . . . But he said to him, (c<sub>3</sub>) Thou answeredst aright."

(i) (Mt.) "*he had muzzled*"

[462] That some confusion existed in the earliest editions of Mark is shewn by the fact that Luke, at this point, gives nothing but the reply (c<sub>2</sub>) "thou saidst well," which he attributes to "some" of the scribes. Much earlier—in a narrative about a "lawyer," who appears to correspond to Mark's "scribe"—Luke assigns the words "thou answeredst aright" to Jesus. Mark gives these words in three different forms, (c<sub>1</sub>, c<sub>2</sub>, c<sub>3</sub>). Matthew, on the other hand, nowhere uses this phrase, but has here—apparently instead of it—a statement

that Jesus had "muzzled" the Sadducees. To "muzzle" an adversary, in this sense, might (even without any error of confusion) be naturally softened down to "answer effectively," "answer well," "answer discreetly." But it also happens that the Hebrew "muzzle (חֶסֶם)" closely resembles the Hebrew "wise (חָכָם)," which, when used as a verb, means "deal discreetly," and sometimes "overcome [an enemy] by discretion." As a working hypothesis, we may suppose that Matthew is here closest to the Original which was, "perceiving that he had muzzled them" (meaning by "them" the Sadducees previously mentioned). Alternatives were placed in the margin, and conflated and variously applied by Mark and Luke."<sup>1</sup>

(ii) "one" or "some" ?

[463] In Luke, "*some*" of the scribes say "Teacher, thou saidst well," after Jesus has silenced the Sadducees. In Mark, "*one*" of the scribes says this, after Jesus has replied to the question about the First or Greatest Commandment. The Hebrew "one of" might easily be confused with the plural of "one," a rare form, which means "a few" but is not used partitively.<sup>2</sup>

[464] The Hebrew "knowing" is twice rendered in Isaiah (LXX) by "saying." Hence Mark's "*knowing* that he had answered well"—a rather curious substitute for "*seeing* (or, *perceiving*) that he had answered well"—might

<sup>1</sup> [462a] The Heb. verb "muzzle" occurs only twice in the Bible, and the derived noun once. In one case the Septuagint translates the verb "build round (so as to impede)," and whereas the Psalmist speaks of putting a "muzzle" on his mouth, the Greek has "a guard." This indicates that there would be a tendency in the present passage to soften down the word. "Muzzle" = חֶסֶם, "wise" = חָכָם; חֶסֶם in Ezek. xxxix. 11 "stop" (but A.V. "stop [the noses of]") = περιικοδομεῖν, in Ps. xxxix. 1, "bridle" (but marg. "muzzle") = φυλακή. In Ex. i. 10, "let-us-deal wisely (נַחֲכֵמָה, from חָכָם, "wise") with (לִ) them," κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς, means, practically, "let us suppress them."

<sup>2</sup> "One of," taken as one word, = אחדם, which, if written אחדם, differs little from אחדם "a few."

be confused with a tradition that the scribe *said* that Jesus had answered well (Luke, "Teacher, thou saidst well").<sup>1</sup>

Some confusion between "one" and "some," combined with other corruptions, may have led Luke to separate a part of Mark's tradition from the rest and to take it as a separate narrative.

(iii) (*Mk.*) "*disputing*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*lawyer*"

[465] The Greek noun "Disputant," corresponding to Mark's participle "disputing," is used in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (i. 20): "Where is the wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the *Disputant* of this world?" It represents a common Hebrew term meaning "investigator," but especially applied to investigation (Midrash), or discussion, of the Law, and hence to the teacher of the Law.<sup>2</sup>

If therefore Mark erroneously rendered "one of the Disputants" by a participle "disputing," it would be natural for a Corrector to place in the margin the correct meaning, viz. "*one learned in the law, or, lawyer.*"

The Corrector may have added "tempting him" in order to shew that the question was not one for information. But the addition may have been suggested from the margin, thus. The word "dispute" also means "inquire into," and hence it might be interpreted as meaning "test," or "try."

<sup>1</sup> [464a] Is. xix. 12, xlviii. 6, forms of יָרָא, ἐπεῖν in both cases. Greek confusion is also easy between (*Mk.* xii. 28) "knowing (εἰδῶς (D. εἰδῶν))" and (*Mk.* xii. 34), "seeing ἰδῶν (D. εἰδῶν)," especially as the latter would often be written ἰδῶ or εἰδῶ. We have also seen above (459 (vi.)) that (as in Job ii. 10) "see (ראה)" may be confused with "say (אמר)." In *Mk.* xii. 28, SS has "heard that he answered well." Comp. *Esth.* iii. 5, "and he saw (וירא)," LXX ἐπιγνοῖς, Lagarde (α) ἤκουσεν.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, *The Jewish People*, Eng. Trans. II. ii. 82, translates רשׁה "sermon," and דרשׁן "preacher." He explains מדרשׁ (ib. i. 330) as "investigation, explanation." The Heb. דרשׁ does not mean "test" or "tempt" in O.T. But it might be inferred to have that meaning from the context here and from such a passage as 1 Chr. xxviii. 9 "the Lord trieth (רשׁה) all hearts," ἐτάζει.



Hence, a marginal rendering might be "*testing*." These two, being combined, might possibly result in the conflation—"( $a_1$ ) a lawyer ( $a_2$ ) trying (or, tempting) him." But on that point see what follows, and especially 466 ( $\eta$ ).

(iv) "*Tempting*," in LXX, an error

[466 ( $a$ )] As regards the "tempting" of Jesus by men, Luke differs widely from Mark, and generally from Matthew (though here he agrees with the latter). And, if we are to discuss the present passage, it is necessary to examine others. The only mention of "tempting" by men, in the LXX, that could be supposed to predict Messianic sufferings, is in the Psalms (LXX version) "*They tempted me, they sorely-mocked me [with] mocking.*"<sup>1</sup> This, however, is an entirely erroneous rendering of the obscure Hebrew, which is, "Like" [so R.V. text; but כִּי mostly means "among," as R.V. marg.] "*the profane (or, hypocrites) mockers in feasts.*" The LXX has taken the letter כ—the preposition here rendered "like" (or "among")—as the first letter of the verb "tempt," finding the rest of the verb in the first two letters of the Hebrew for "profane" (or "hypocrites").<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xxxv. 16 ἐπειράσαν με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με μυκτηρισμόν.

<sup>2</sup> [466 ( $a$ )  $a$ ] Ps. xxxv. 16 (lit.) "Among (כִּי) profane [men] (פְּנִי) mockers-for (לְעִנִּי) cake (מֶנֶחַ),"*i.e.* table-jesters. If the Hebrew is not corrupt, the LXX took כ followed by נח as כח "test," "try," "tempt." This is generally used of God "trying" men; but in Ps. xcv. 9, Mal. iii. 10 and iii. 15, it is used of men "proving" or "tempting" God. Also the LXX took מנח ("cake") as a repetition of נח ("mock").

[466 ( $a$ )  $\delta$ ] As regards the word ηη, rendered by R.V. "profane," Gesen. Oxf. gives the radical meaning as "profane," but adds "N. H. Hiph. Aram. Aph. *act falsely toward*; חַפְזָה, *hypocrisy*." It=μιαλῶ (3), φονοκτονῶ (3), ἀνομος (2), ἀσεβής (5), δόλος (1), παράνομος (2), ὑποκριτής (2). The LXX renderings of it as ὑποκριτής, "*hypocrite*," are in Job xxxiv. 30 (R.V.), "that the *godless* man reign not," xxxvi. 13 "But they that are *godless* in heart lay up anger." The reader will perceive that the word might cause difficulty to translators of a Hebrew Gospel. Taking it in its Biblical sense, some might regard it as meaning "defiled," "godless," "breakers of the law," a term that would well apply to Herod and the Herodians. Josephus testifies (*Ant.* xviii. 5. 2) to the popular



(v) *Similar errors apparently in the Synoptists*

[466 (β)] Compare the following passages :

Mk. xii. 15.

"But he knowing their hypocrisy said to them, Why tempt ye me? Bring (449) me a denarius."

Mt. xxii. 18.

"But Jesus perceiving their wickedness said, Why tempt ye me, hypocrites? Shew-forth to me the coin of the tribute."

Lk. xx. 23.

"But having seen into their villainy he said to them, Shew (449) me a denarius."

As above (365), the Hebrew for Mark's "know" might be "see *in*" (*i.e.* "have knowledge *in*, understanding *in*"). Also the word used here by Delitzsch to represent "hypocrisy" is the same as that used in the Psalm above quoted about "*profane* mockers."<sup>1</sup> But this would give in Mark precisely the same letters (ב- followed by ח-נ) which in the Psalm have induced the LXX to adopt the combination of בוחן (*i.e.* בחן) as meaning "tempt." Again, we have seen above (459 (vi.)) that "see," in this sense, has been confused with the familiar word "say." The two corruptions of "see" into "say," and "hypocrisy" into "tempt," would result in a new rendering, "he said . . . ye tempt." This, taken interrogatively, and conflated, would produce something very like Mark's version, "knowing their hypocrisy he said Tempt ye me?" Matthew's differs little from this. Luke's shorter

belief that Herod lay under God's special displeasure for the murder of John the Baptist. Levy (see חתן) quotes some passages that use the word of "flattering" great people (*e.g.* Agrippa), but others that apply it to a "godless" king (*e.g.* Ahasuerus), and others that apply it to "heresy" *e.g.* "In every place where in Scripture the word חתן occurs, *heresy* (worship of false gods) is to be understood." Such a word might be applied by the common people to Herod as "godless" and to the Herodians as also "godless" (or as Herod's "flatterers"), by the Pharisees to Sadducees as "heretics," and by Jesus to the Pharisees as being the true "heretics."

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xii. 15 "their hypocrisy," Delitzsch חתנות. The Temptation by Satan is excluded from this discussion as not being a temptation *by men*.

version may then be explained by the supposition that he omitted the question assigned to Jesus as being based on the same error as that in the LXX. Toward the close of the first century, when the LXX was being studied by Jews and Christians under stress of controversy, it was inevitable that attention should be called to so conspicuous an error as that of the unique passage in the LXX describing the "tempting" of the Messiah by men.<sup>1</sup>

[466 (γ)] Take another passage, a long dialogue about divorce, where Mark and Matthew represent Christ as being "tempted" by Pharisees. It occurs immediately before Christ's prohibition of divorce. Mark has just said (x. 1) "And multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again." Luke omits the whole

<sup>1</sup> [466 (β) α] Antecedently it is probable that an Evangelist, finding himself compelled—as we suppose Luke to have been—to give up one part of an alleged Messianic prediction, would fall back upon another part of the context. Ps. xxxv. 16, the same verse that mentions "profane" (LXX "tempt"), mentions also "mocking (ἐξεμυκτήρισαν)." This Greek word is rare in the Hebrew LXX, occurring only thrice. Once it is used of the Lord "mocking" evil-doers: once in the Messianic Psalm (xxii. 7) "All they that see me *laugh me to scorn* (ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με): they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, [saying], Commit thyself unto the Lord; let him deliver him . . ." Everyone admits that the Synoptists had this passage in view when describing the mocking of Jesus on the Cross: and there *Luke alone* (Lk. xxiii. 35) *uses this rare word* (Mk.-Mt. having "blaspheme"). It occurs only *once again* in N.T. This is in the course of a number of parables and sayings apparently uttered after Jesus (Lk. xiv. 1) "went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a sabbath to eat bread," so that any "mocking" recorded in that connection might be supposed to take place *at the table* (comp. Ps. xxxv. 16 "mockers for cake," i.e. "table-jesters" (466 (α) α)). If the Psalmist's expression, "mockers for cake," implied greediness, it would be unsuitable for Luke, since he could not accuse the Pharisees of being "greedy" of food. But he might take this as a figurative expression denoting covetousness, and accordingly he says (Lk. xvi. 14) "The Pharisees, who were *lovers of money*, heard all these things," and they "*mocked* (ἐξεμυκτήρισον)" at Christ. We find then that ἐμυκτηρίζειν occurs in the LXX practically only twice (setting aside the "mocking" of men by God), and in N.T. only twice; that in LXX it refers on both occasions to the mocking of the Messiah; that on one of these occasions Luke (xxiii. 35) has certainly borrowed it in that sense. The conclusion must be regarded as highly probable that on the other occasion (xvi. 14) Luke is also borrowing the word as containing a Messianic allusion.

dialogue, but has (four verses before the prohibition) a mention of Pharisees "mocking"—

Mk. x. 2.

"And [[having come - to [him] [some] Pharisees]]<sup>1</sup> began to question him, if it is [or, Is it, εἰ] lawful for a husband (ἀνδρὶ) to put away a wife (γυναικα), tempting him."

Mt. xix. 3.

"And there came- to him [some] Pharisees tempting him and saying, Is it (εἰ) lawful [for a husband] to put away his wife for every cause?"

[Lk. xvi. 14.]

"But there were hearing all these things the Pharisees being lovers of money and they mocked him."

If the doubly bracketed words are omitted in Mark, we must suppose either that the subject is impersonal ("people began to question"), or that the subject is "they" referring to the "multitudes" just mentioned by him (Mk. x. 1). A little later on, Mark has (Mk. x. 10) "And in the house *again* the disciples began to question him about this," which favours the view that the disciples, along with others, had asked the question *before*, and now asked it "*again*." But, if so, "tempting" seems inapplicable to what was apparently an honest inquiry for information, and Luke might naturally think the word erroneous. The position of the phrase "tempting him" in Mark (differing as it does from that in Matthew) suggests that the original had simply "And they began to *question* him, Is it lawful . . wife." Some later Evangelists took "question," or "discuss" (דרש), as meaning "test," "tempt," and inserted the latter at first in the margin, and afterwards in the text, but in different positions. Mark inserted it at the end as a supplementary explanation of the nature of the "questioning." Matthew placed it

<sup>1</sup> W. H. bracket "having come-to [him] [some] Pharisees" as possibly an interpolation. The words are omitted by SS.



earlier and substituted it for "question." Luke rejected it as an error.

[466 (δ)] Another mention of "tempting" occurs in Mark in connection with a demand for a sign from heaven. This, like the last, occurs in a passage wholly omitted by Luke. But Luke inserts a similar demand just after the charge of "casting out devils by Beelzebub," where it seems to be out of place.

Mk. viii. 11.

"And there went forth the Pharisees and began to discuss with (συνζητεῖν, lit. seek-with) him, seeking (ζητοῦντες) from him a sign from heaven, tempting him."

Mt. xvi. 1.

"And having-come-to [him] the [W.H. bracket "the"] Pharisees and Sadducees (lit.) questioned (ἐπηρώτησαν) him [about] a sign out of heaven to shew them."<sup>1</sup>

Lk. xi. 16.

"But others, tempting, began to seek from him a sign out of heaven."

Comp. Mt. xii. 38.

"Then answered him some of the scribes and Pharisees saying, Teacher, we desire to see a sign from thee."

This indicates that Luke accepted a tradition that a "sign" was asked from Jesus by some who "tempted" Him, but that he did not feel sure who the askers were. Whence this doubt? And why does Matthew insert

<sup>1</sup> [466 (δ) a] There is no instance of ἐπερωτᾶν with inf. meaning "ask a person to do" either in LXX or N.T., and L.S. alleges none from Greek literature. In Ps. cxxxvii. 3 "asked us songs," LXX has ἠρώτησαν ἡμᾶς λόγους ψδῶν (8<sup>ca</sup> ART ἐπηρώτησαν). Ἐπερωτᾶν, besides meaning "consult an oracle," means legal questioning (e.g. "Do you acknowledge this debt?") (456 (ii) a). The English rendering of Mt. xvi. 1 above aims at shewing the difficulty of the construction.



"Sadducee" and leave out "tempt"? These questions we shall try to answer in what follows.

(vi) "*Tempt*," "*Herod*," "*Sadducees*," "*hypocrisy*"

[466 (ε)] It is intelligible that difference of opinion may have arisen if conflated traditions connected the "tempting" of Jesus with the term *Chânaph*, applied by some (466 (a) b) to the Pharisees, as being "hypocrites," but by others to Sadducees as being "breakers of the Law," and by others still more appropriately to the Herodians as being "profane" and "godless." As an illustration of this, compare:—

Mk. viii. 15.

Mt. xvi. 6.

Lk. xii. 1.

"See, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of *Herod*."

"See and take heed of the leaven of the Pharisees and *Sadducees*."

"Take heed to yourselves of the leaven, which is *hypocrisy*, of the Pharisees."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [466 (ε) a] SS agrees with D and with Tisch. (against W. H.) in reading "of the Pharisees, *which is hypocrisy*."

If "Herod" was called by the Galilean Church "the *Chânaph*," and if this was rendered by some "hypocrite" or "act hypocritically," then we might expect "Herodians" in one Gospel to be parallel to the verb "act hypocritically" or "pretend (*ὑποκρίνεσθαι*)" in another. Compare:—

Mk. xii. 13.

Mt. xxii. 16.

Lk. xx. 20.

"They send unto him some of the Pharisees and the *Herodians*."

"They [*i.e.* the Pharisees] send to him their disciples *with the Herodians*."

"They sent [spies] (*ἐγκαθέτους*) *pretending* (*ὑποκρινόμενοι*) themselves to be righteous."

[466 (ε) b] The only other passage mentioning "the Herodians" is:—

Mk. iii. 6.

Mt. xii. 14.

Lk. vi. 11.

"And having gone forth the Pharisees straightway *with the Herodians* began to appoint (*ἰδίδου*) a joint-council (*συμβούλιον*) against him in order that they might destroy him."

"But having gone forth the Pharisees took (*ἔλαβον*) joint-counsel (*συμβούλιον*) against him in order that they might destroy him."

"But they (*αὐτοὶ δὲ*) were filled with madness (*ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνίας*) and began to talk to one another what they should do to Jesus."

Here an original "men of profanity (or, hypocrisy)" may have been taken by

[466 (ζ)] We infer from the last paragraph that in the tradition about the demand for a sign from heaven (466) (δ), the text varied between "tempting" and "with profane persons." Matthew took it as the latter, and considered it to mean "with the Sadducees," whom he supposes to have accompanied the Pharisees. He therefore inserted "Sadducees" and omitted "tempt." Luke adopted "tempt," but, finding the personality of the tempters obscure, left it an open question under the term "others."

Mk. as meaning "Herodians." Mt. may have regarded it as a mere epithet of Pharisees ("the Pharisees, and, *i.e.* even, the hypocrites") and may consequently have omitted it. Lk. may have rendered it "profanity." The Biblical Hebrew (Job xvi. 10) "filled themselves against" *i.e.* "gathered themselves in a council against" may have been taken by Lk. as the New Hebrew (Esth. v. 5, 9; Dan. iii. 19) "were filled with." Thus Mk.'s "there gathered together the Herodians" would become Lk.'s "they were filled with profanity," which is often described as "folly" or "madness." Or "profanity" may have been originally *ἀνομίας*, changed by Greek corruption (comp. 1 K. viii. 32, Dan. xii. 10, Job xxxiii. 23) into *ἀνομίας*. But the latter is used in 2 Tim. iii. 9 concerning men "corrupted in mind."

[466 (ε) c] The question is important, because it bears on Christ's use of the word "hypocrite." Mark uses it only once (Mk. vii. 6) "Well prophesied Isaiah concerning you, *the hypocrites*." Now Isaiah does not expressly say of the prophets and priests as Jeremiah does (xxiii. 11), that they are "profane (*Chānaph*)"; but against the Pharisees, who did not claim to be prophets or priests, Isaiah's prophecy might be quoted (Is. ix. 16, 17) "They that lead this people cause them to err . . . every one is *profane*," so that the Assyrian, as the instrument of God's wrath, is to be sent against this (*ib.* x. 6) "*profane* nation." The meaning is, that the teachers of Israel are "profane" in the sense of "ungodly," "practically atheistic," "defiled, or corrupted, to the very soul." What is commonly meant by "hypocrite" is one who has a sense of, and simulates, virtue. But Jesus may have meant one who had *no sense* of real virtue, being blind to it. Similarly Bacon says that the *real* atheists, or, as he calls it, "the great atheists" are hypocrites, who are "ever handling holy things, *but without feeling*, so as they must needs be cauterized in the end" (*Essays*, xvi. 60).

It is noteworthy that Lk. never uses the word "hypocrite" in the Triple Tradition. In the Double Tradition he has it twice, Lk. vi. 42 (where Mt. has it) and Lk. xii. 56 (where the parall. Mt. xvi. 3 is bracketed as doubtful by W. H.). He has it once in his Single Tradition (Lk. xiii. 15). In the parall. to Mt. xxiv. 51 "he shall appoint his portion with *the hypocrites*," Lk. xii. 46 has "with *the unbelievers* (*ἀπίστωται*)." The Fourth Gospel never mentions either "hypocrite" or "hypocrisy."

## (vii) "Lawyer"

[466 (η)] Now going back to (462) the description of the "tempting" of Jesus, we have to note that here alone does Matthew use the word "lawyer (*νομικός*).<sup>1</sup> It is generally supposed to be a term that lays stress on the *teaching* of the Law, whereas "scribe" means, literally, "a lettered person," and might be taken to mean (especially by Greeks) a mere "writer" of the Law. But no commentator has alleged a Hebrew word exactly corresponding to the Greek one.<sup>1</sup>

A comment on the Pauline mention of "the wise," "the scribe," and "the disputer," gives a Jewish tradition saying that God shewed to Adam every generation with its "disputers," its "wise," its "scribes," and its "rulers."<sup>2</sup> In the Mishna, the word "scribes" is only used of the teachers of antiquity: contemporary scribes are called "wise."<sup>3</sup> These various titles of teachers may explain how divergences might arise among Evangelists in speaking of them. Different Hebrew words might be chosen, beside the possibility of rendering the same Hebrew word by different Greek words.

One title for "teacher," found in the Chronicles and Ezra, and likely to be used by an Evangelist writing in

<sup>1</sup> [466 (η) a] Matthew, grouping together Christ's condemnations of the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," begins with a charge that (Mt. xxiii. 4) "they bind heavy burdens" on men, which they will not move with their finger. Luke, after mentioning some of Christ's charges against the Pharisees, adds (Lk. xi. 45-6) "But *one of the lawyers* answering said, Teacher, saying these things, thou dost insult us *also* (*καὶ ἡμᾶς*). But he said, *To you, also* (*καὶ ὑμῶν*), *the lawyers*, woe, for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne . . ." This seems to imply a different class; and *Hor. Hebr.* (iii. p. 125) says, "It is not easy to give the reason why he is termed a lawyer and not a scribe." In many respects "priests" would be more suitable than "lawyers" here. For the priests—apart from the aristocratic families of high-priests who were mostly Sadducees—were held in reverence by the Pharisees, and were allowed precedence by them; and there was (*Schürer*, Eng. Tr. II. ii. p. 30) "a large number of priests who themselves belonged to the Rabbinical class." See 466 (η) c.

<sup>2</sup> *Hor. Hebr.* on 1 Cor. i. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Schürer*, II. i. p. 314.



Biblical Hebrew, is derived from the root "understand" and means literally "one that makes [others] intelligent." But it is capable of an emphatic instead of a causative meaning, so that it may signify "intelligent," and it is sometimes so taken by LXX, and by R.V., where other authorities take it to mean "teacher."<sup>1</sup> The root (בין) is confused in Job with the Hebrew (בחן) for the word "tempt," used here by Matthew and Luke alone, and in Daniel with the Hebrew (ברא) for the word "approach," used here by Mark alone.<sup>2</sup> This word (בין), meaning "discreet," might also account for Mark's tradition that the man answered "discreetly," and generally for Mark's favourable view of him. But, on the other hand, "discreetly" may represent an original "wisely"; and it has been shewn that there may have been a confusion (462) between "muzzle" and "wise" (חכם and חסם).

Amid great uncertainty of detail, it is highly probable that some very early doubt as to the status of this interlocutor with Jesus concerning the Great Commandment caused Evangelists to resort to different terms such as (a) "disputant,"<sup>3</sup> (b) "teacher" (lit. "making-intelligent"),<sup>4</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> The root is בין. Ezr. viii. 16 R.V. txt. "teachers," but marg. and A.V. "(men of) understanding," and so LXX (Ezr. viii. 16 συνιόντας, 1 Esdr. viii. 43 ἐπιστήμονας), 1 Chr. xxv. 8 "teachers," LXX "perfect (τελείων)."

In 1 Chr. xv. 22, xxv. 7, xxvii. 32, R.V. has "skilful" or "man of understanding," but Gesen. Oxf. "teacher."

<sup>2</sup> Job xxxiv. 36 "were tried (i.e. tested)" (בחן), μάθε (leg. בין), Dan. ix. 22 "and he instructed me," Theod. συνέτισε (בין), LXX προσήλθε (leg. βρα).

<sup>3</sup> [466 (η) δ] The Arabic Diatessaron, instead of "one of the scribes, *having heard them disputing*," has "one of the scribes of those that knew the Law." This represents Mt.-Lk.'s "lawyer." But the fact that the Diatessaron omits "having heard them disputing"—though it would have been quite easy to incorporate the words in the Harmony—suggests that the Harmonizer believed the omitted words to mean "a Disputant," or "Lawyer."

<sup>4</sup> [466 (η) ε] In 2 K. xi. 9 "the priest (הכהן)," LXX has συνετός, suggesting that it read המבין = "teacher" or "man of understanding," and in 1 Esdr. ix. 40, "priests (ιερείς)" represents the parall. Nehem. viii. 2 "had understanding." In Lk. x. 25 f. the parable about the Good Samaritan, who surpassed in righteousness both the Levite and the Priest, is addressed to a "lawyer," but it would come with much more appropriateness if addressed to a "priest." See 466 (η) α.



perhaps also (c) "wise." These various readings, being corrupted, have produced serious divergences.

The independent departure of Matthew and Luke from Mark combines with many indications of conflation in the latter to indicate that Mark's narrative must be regarded as corrupt.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [466 (η) d]. It may be urged that "tempting" is out of the question because, according to Mk. xii. 34, Jesus says to the man, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." But is not this a strange reply for Jesus to make to a man who merely repeats the quotation from Deuteronomy, with an added allusion to the passages of Scripture (1 S. xv. 22, Prov. xxi. 3, Ps. l. 23, li. 16, 17, lxix. 31, Hos. vi. 6, Is. i. 11, Amos v. 22) that describe the superiority of goodness, or of piety, or of obedience, to sacrifice—an answer that might have been made by any hypocritical Jew professing to be religious? According to Lk. x. 28 Jesus says something quite different:—"Do this and thou shalt live." And Mk. exhibits so many signs of corruption and error in the context that he may be wrong here also. Probably Mk. has preserved the original words "far from," but in a wrong construction, as follows.

Jesus has been quoting, and the "lawyer" has been repeating, the commandment that includes the *theory* of the Law. Now in a well-known and often-quoted passage, a final mention of the *theory* is closely followed by a mention of the *practice*, and introduced with the words "far off" (Deut. xxx. 10, 11) "... if thou turn unto the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul. For this commandment . . . it is not too hard for thee (מִכָּד), neither *is it far off*," lit. "far off [is] it (רחוק הוא)," where the LXX has "it is not burdensome, neither [is it] *far from thee*." These words are intended to enjoin doing instead of talking; and the passage continues (Deut. xxx. 14) "the word is very *nigh unto thee* in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest *do it*."

If Mk.'s original, condensing the Deuteronomic passage, had "not far from thee [is] it," *i.e.* הוא רחוק מִכָּד, it only needed a slight change in the last two words to obtain "not far-off [is the] *kingdom* (מַמְלָכָה, written as סַמְלָכָה)." Comp. 1 K. ix. 26 "the king (הַמֶּלֶךְ)" = 2 Chr. viii. 17 "went (הֵלֵךְ)." "From thee" would be readily supplied, and this might be paraphrased and amplified into, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

Now in answer to a verbose inquirer as to the Great Commandment it is very natural that Jesus should reply briefly—with allusion to Deut. xxx. 11—"Not far from thee [is] it," meaning, "This is a matter of everyday practice, not of talk," or, "Go, then, and *do* this, for you need *not go far*." But, if so, Mk. has completely misrepresented Christ's words. On the other hand Lk.—especially if we bear in mind that the Deuteronomic words are followed by a promise of "life" (Deut. xxx. 16 "that thou mayest *live*")—substantially expresses the meaning both here ("Do this and thou shalt *live*") and also in the words that he appends to the illustrative parable that follows (Lk. x. 37) "*Go, and do thou likewise*."

The obscurity of the original might explain why Mt. gives no version of it. But it is possible that Mt. may have dropped a letter from רחוק הוא the two last

- (viii) (*Mk.*) "*first . . . of all*," (*Mt.*) "*great . . . in the law*,"  
 (*Lk.*) "*in the law what is written?*"

[467] It was shewn above (429) that—in describing the discussion of the question "Who is the greater?"—Mark used the word "first" as a free translation of the Hebrew "great" applied to "first-born." So here, the Original was "great in the Law," but Mark uses "first" to denote the Hebraic "great," *i.e.* "greatest," that which comes first in honour,<sup>1</sup> or, as the Arabic Diatessaron says, in the English translation, "the great and pre-eminent commandment." He also paraphrases "in the Law" by the phrase "of all," meaning of all the enactments of the Law. But he has expressed it ungrammatically. He might have said "(*a*<sub>1</sub>) first (fem.) of all the commandments (fem.)," or "(*a*<sub>2</sub>) coming-first-before all things (neut.)." But he has fused the two.

- (ix) "*Rab*" meaning "*great*" confused with "*Rab*" meaning "*Rabbi*"

[468] On account of Mark's inaccuracy, later Evangelists followed a correction that returned to the original Hebrew "in the Law"; and, so far, Matthew and Luke agreed. But they differed in the following details. The word *Rāb* means "great," but it also means "Rabbi." Matthew conflated it in his version: "*Rabbi*, what commandment [is] *great* in the law?" But Luke found a tradition that took *Rāb* as meaning "Rabbi" and nothing else, so that it left a gap, "*Rabbi*, what commandment [ ] in the Law?" This might be interpreted "what is commanded in the Law

words of the Deuteronomic quotation, thus obtaining "The Law [consists in] this," which he paraphrased as "On these two commandments the whole Law hangs, and the prophets."

<sup>1</sup> The Jews were also in the habit of distinguishing the "light" precepts from the "heavy" precepts: but this was not the scribe's question.

[i.e. for the inheritance of eternal life]?” or else, “what is prescribed, or written, in the Law?” and Luke combines these interpretations.<sup>1</sup>

(x) *Did Jesus, or the lawyer, quote the words “Thou shalt love the Lord”?*

[469] Luke alone, against Mark and Matthew, represents the lawyer, and not Jesus, as quoting these words (Lk. x. 26, 27): “But he (Jesus) said unto him, ‘In the law what is written? *How readest thou?*’ But he answering said, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord. . . .’”

The explanation is as follows. The question “How readest thou?” was commonly used by a Rabbi to introduce a Scriptural quotation *that he himself was about to use*. This was in the original Hebrew and was omitted by Mark as being a mere sign of quotation. Luke, who alone preserves the question, very naturally supposes that it expected an answer from *the person addressed*, that is, from the lawyer, and consequently that the lawyer uttered the words “Thou shalt love the Lord” in answer to the question, “How readest thou?”<sup>2</sup>

On this hypothesis, we can also explain why Mark represents the scribe as repeating the quotation, while

<sup>1</sup> It is also possible that the Original had simply, “what in the law [is] great (גדול)?” Mark (followed by Mt.) may have supplied “commandment.” This short form—especially if it was taken to mean “what [is] in the Law, Rabbi?”—would very well explain Luke’s conflation, “(a<sub>1</sub>) *In the Law* what is written? (a<sub>2</sub>) *How readest thou?*” Schöttg. on Mt. xxii. 36 (vol. i. p. 183) gives an instance of the application of “great” to precepts, though “heavy” is more common.

<sup>2</sup> [469a] See *Hor. Hebr.* (on Lk. x. 26), which gives several instances of “*How readest thou?*” “an expression very common in the Schools when any person brought a text of Scripture for the proof of anything.” *Hor. Hebr.* assumes that Lk. is historically correct, but admits a “departure” from common usage: “He (Jesus) *departs from their common use of speech*, in that he calls to another to allege some text of Scripture; whereas it was usual in the Schools that he that spoke that (i.e. this formula) would allege some place (i.e. text) himself.” It seems more probable that there was no “departure,” but that Lk. fell into a very natural error.



Matthew does not. Mark probably conflated the correct tradition, that Jesus uttered the quotation, with an incorrect one, that it was uttered by the scribe, making the scribe's utterance a repetition of Christ's, and adding to the text some marginal comment (about "burnt-offerings") without which the repetition would have been meaningless. In the Original, it is probable that Jesus alone quoted the Deuteronomic precept, adding two or three words—wholly misrepresented by Mark and almost as much by Matthew (466 (η) d)—to the effect that the precept must be fulfilled in daily practice.

§ 59. (Mk.) "*in his teaching*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*disciples*"

Mk. xii. 37, 38.

Mt. xxiii. 1.

Lk. xx. 45.

"And the common people heard him gladly, and in his teaching he said."

"Then Jesus spake to the multitudes and to his disciples saying."

"And in the hearing of all the people he said to the disciples."

(i) (Mk.) "*teaching*," (Lk.) "*hearing*"

[470] To express a prophetic "message," Hebrew may use the noun "hearing," as in Isaiah, "Who hath believed our *message*?" which St. Paul, following the Septuagint, quotes as "Who hath believed our *hearing*?"<sup>1</sup> In the present passage, if the original was "*in his hearing*," i.e. preaching, and if it was interpreted "hearing," it would seem necessary, for Greeks, to alter "his" to "their." "Disciples," "multitudes," or "people," would then need to be added to express *who* were "hearing." The correction, adopted in different forms by Matthew and Luke, may have taken place either in a Hebrew or in a Greek original.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rom. x. 16 (also Jn. xii. 38) quoting Is. liii. 1 (שמעו from שמו "hear")  
 τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;

<sup>2</sup> If the original was ἐν τῇ ἀκοῇ αὐτοῦ, it would be very natural to regard ἀγτοῦ as an error for ἀγτῶ.



(ii) (*Mk.*) "*the common people*"

Both in Hebrew and in Greek "the people the many" might be easily taken as "the people [with Jesus] *and* the many," so as to mean two classes; and this view—in different ways—may have been taken by Matthew and Luke. But it is also possible that the Corrector may have taken "his teaching" to be "his taught ones," *i.e.* "his disciples," an easy confusion in Hebrew, but not in Greek.

(iii) (*Mk.*) "*heard him gladly*"

The later Evangelists would certainly not have omitted an authoritative statement that the people "heard Jesus *gladly*." The original was, "the common people heard him *and rejoiced* (וִיחָדוּ)." But this word closely resembles the word יחדיו "*together*": and the words are at least twice confused by the Septuagint.<sup>1</sup> Matthew and Luke, adopting the latter rendering, describe Jesus as, in effect, addressing two classes of hearers "*together*"—*which Codex Bezae reads*.<sup>2</sup>

§ 60. *Walking "in robes"*

Mk. xii. 38.

"... who like  
to walk about in  
robes and salutations  
... and chief seats."

Mt. xxiii. 5-7.

"... and they  
enlarge their borders.  
But they *love* ...  
and the chief seats  
... and the saluta-  
tions."

Lk. xx. 46.

"... who like to  
walk about in robes  
and *love* salutations."

<sup>1</sup> Job iii. 6 "rejoice (יחד from חדר)" (marg. "be joined with" leg. as from יחד), Ps. lxxxvi. 11 "unite (יחד)" εὐφρανθήσω (leg. as from חדר).

<sup>2</sup> [470a] In Mk. xii. 38, D reads ο δε δεδασκων αμα (lit. "teaching *together*"). In classical Greek, this should mean "at the moment of teaching." But, if thus rendered, it would be quite superfluous. *On the other hand* αμα = יחד 35 times. *It is probable that D is here following a tradition that substituted יחדיו for יחדו.*

## (i) "love"

[471] The coupling of "to walk" with "salutations," as objects of "like," is as harsh in Greek as in English, and is naturally corrected in the edition followed by Luke: "like to walk, *and love* salutations." Matthew prefers to retain one verb and to drop the infinitive here (though he has an infinitive in the following verse). This is one of many passages where the harshness of Mark's style makes it probable that his Gospel was the earliest and was corrected by later Evangelists.

## (ii) "robes"

[472] It has been shewn above (388) that "border" might be taken as "garment," and that Mark rendered it so, where Matthew and Luke rendered it "border of the garment." According to Mark's rendering here, the fault of the Pharisees consisted in wearing "(long) robes," a fault frequently censured by Roman writers. Wetstein illustrates this passage by one from Marcus Aurelius, using this very phrase, "do not walk about in *a* [long] robe at home." The phrase "walk in," meaning "shew off," is used by Epictetus when he reproves the practice of "walking about in purple": and Horace satirizes the upstart who "struts about in a toga six ells long."<sup>1</sup> To "walk in robes," then, would be an expression very familiar to the Roman readers of St. Mark's Gospel; but it is not what the Original meant—viz. the enlarging of the "borders" or rather "fringes" ordained by the Law.<sup>2</sup> There are grounds for thinking that in other details of the context, as well as in this, Mark is less faithful than Matthew to the Original.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Epictet. iii. 32. 10, Hor. *Epod.* iv. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Numb. xv. 38, Deut. xxii. 12. Dr. J. B. Mayor calls to my attention Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 9. 16, where περιβολαίων—which would generally mean, and perhaps may there mean, "clothing"—"seems to be used for phylacteries."

<sup>3</sup> [472a] In the context, Mark's (Mk. xii. 40 sim. Lk. xx. 47) "making long prayers" is a not unlikely mistranslation of a Heb. original correctly rendered by

§ 61. *The reply of Jesus to Judas*

Mk. xiv. 44, 45.

"Now he that  
(lit.) betrayeth him  
. . . And having  
come straightway  
having come to him  
he saith, 'Rabbi,'  
and kissed him."

Mt. xxvi. 48-50.

"Now he that  
(lit.) betrayeth him  
. . . And straight-  
way having come to  
Jesus, he said, 'Hail,  
Rabbi' and kissed  
him. *But Jesus said  
to him, 'Companion,  
to [that to] which  
thou art come,  
[hasten].'*"

Lk. xxii. 47, 48.

"And he drew-  
nigh to Jesus to kiss  
him. *But Jesus said  
to him, 'With a kiss  
betrayest thou the  
Son of man?'*"

## [473] The silence of Mark and John, and the great

Matthew "making-broad *Tephillin* (or, *phylacteries*)," since the word also means "prayers."

[472<sup>b</sup>] As regards Matthew's last detail, namely, "and to be called . . . Rabbi," it must be noted that Codex D and SS repeat "Rabbi," and probably the Original was ". . . and that there shall be called to them Rabbi, Rabbi." But (i) "there shall be called" may easily be read as "there shall befall," and (ii) "*Rabbi*" as "*judgment*," or "*condemnation*." And the twofold repetition might be taken to mean "*double condemnation*." This might be paraphrased by Mark "they shall receive more abundant condemnation."

[472<sup>c</sup>] There is a frequent precedent for (i) the former error in the LXX, which often confuses קרא, "call," and קרה, "befall." Indeed in Prov., whenever (ix. 18, xii. 23, xxiv. 8) *συμβαίνει* ("befall") occurs, it = Heb. "call." See also Prov. xx. 6 (R.V. txt.) "proclaim," (marg.) "meet," xxvii. 16 (R.V. txt.) "encountereth," (marg.) "bewareth itself." Again, (ii) *ῥβ* meaning "great," "multitude," "mighty," etc., is confused with *ῥβ* meaning "cause," or "contend" in Ex. xxiii. 2, "in a *cause* (πλήθους)," Is. xix. 20, lxiii. 1. In Deut. xxxiii. 7, R.V. offers "sufficient" as a marg. alternative for "contended." In Is. xlv. 9, "him that striveth" = βέλτιον, i.e. "strong[er] [than]." "Judging judging"—since duplication often implies emphasis in the prophets (e.g. Is. xlviii. 11)—Mark might regard as meaning "*two-fold, i.e. abundant, judging*."

If this explanation is correct, Mark is wrong, even on the supposition that he read רב for ריב. For ריב does not mean "judge," but "plead, or contend [for, or, against]." But Mark may have erred in company with the LXX, as in Job x. 2 "thou contendest with (i.e. against) me," LXX "thou judgest (ἐκπας) me," Is. li. 22 "pleadeth the cause of his people," LXX "judging (κρίνων) his people." In Jerem. li. 36 (lit.) "I will contend thy contention," i.e. "plead thy cause," LXX has "I will judge (κρίνω) thine adversary."

difference between Matthew and Luke as to the reply alleged to have been made by our Lord to Judas, suggest that the original Gospel contained no reply. But, if so, whence arose the tradition of one? And why does Luke make no mention of words uttered by Judas?

(i) *Luke's omission of Judas' words*

[474] The Original may have had, literally, "And he [Judas] came, and straightway he called-out to him to peace"—that is, he proclaimed "All is well," "There is no danger." These words are mistranslated in Deuteronomy; and such an idiom might naturally be paraphrased by some Evangelists, and misunderstood by others.

Mark has paraphrased it as a mere salutation ("Rabbi") followed by an embrace; and so has Matthew, with the addition of the Greek "hail."

But Luke misunderstood "call out," taking it either as "meet" (with which it is practically (472c) identical), or else as "draw near," קרב, which is similar to "call out," קרא, and is once confused with the latter.<sup>1</sup> This made a difference in what followed. In Mark and Matthew "*and* kissed him" could only be taken as "*and*"; but when preceded by "drew near," a verb implying purpose, "*and*" might mean "that." Accordingly Luke has "drew near *that* he might kiss him."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [474a] Deut. xx. 10 "then proclaim peace unto it," LXX, "and call them forth in peace," καὶ ἐκκάλεσαι αὐτοὺς μετ' εἰρήνης. "Call out," "proclaim" = קרא: "meet" (used of fortuitous meeting) = קרב. The two are often interchanged (472c). "Draw near" = קרב, which appears confused with קרא "call" in Ps. lxxv. 1 "for thy name is *near*," ἐπικαλεσθμεθα.

<sup>2</sup> [474b] For *vaw* indicating purpose yet rendered by the Greek past indicative, see I K. xiii. 33. For *vaw* indicating a past fact, and rendered by *wa* with subjunctive, see Dan. ii. 49 LXX (but Theod. with R.V. καὶ). There are many such instances (240).



(ii) *The origin of the reply assigned to Jesus*

[475] If the above explanation is correct, the "he-called out," which was in the original Hebrew, has disappeared from our extant Gospels. The dispute about its meaning, and its similarity to "draw near," might induce some to write in the margin ( $a_1$ ) "he said," others ( $a_2$ ) "he came," or "approached," or "drew near."<sup>1</sup>

Mark appears to have conflated these. At least the hypothesis of a conflation explains the curious combination of two verbs of coming: "*having come* straight-way ( $a_1$ ) *having come - to him* ( $a_2$ ) he saith." He rightly connects "saith" with Judas.

But other Evangelists might take "he said" to mean that *Jesus* "said" something in reply to the traitorous act of Judas, and might endeavour to supply from the context, or from other tradition, *what* Jesus said.<sup>2</sup>

[476] Luke seems to have been misled by the rare combination of the article with the participle "the [one] betraying," which occurs here in the other three evangelists.<sup>3</sup> Luke has the verb interrogatively "Art thou betraying?" The discrepancy is readily explained by the fact that the Hebrew letter signifying the article may also be used interrogatively.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, if the original was, "Now there [had] said Judas, *the [one] betraying*, The man whom I

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 2 K. xi. 14 "Athaliah . . . cried (קרא) Treason, treason" = 2 Chr. xxiii. 13 "A . . . said (אמר) Treason, treason," LXX, in both, *βοῶν*.

<sup>2</sup> See another instance (459 i-iv) of a possible marginal gloss "said," causing Matthew and Luke to make a dialogue where the original Gospel seems not to have contained one.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xiv. 44, Mt. xxvi. 48, Jn. xviii. 2, 5 ὁ παραδίδους αὐτόν.

<sup>4</sup> [476a] Thus, in Job xxv. 2 (lit.) "The dominion (המסל), the LXX taking *Mashal* in its familiar sense of "parable" (*παραβολή*), as in Job xxvii. 1, xxix. 1) has "What parable"? and in Amos vi. 2 "[Be they] better (הטרים)?" the LXX has "the best." For confusion between the vocative prefix and the article comp. 2 S. xxiv. 23 "All this, O (ה) king," marg. "the king"; Ps. ix. 6 "the enemy," marg. and A.V. "O thou enemy," LXX "the enemy."

kiss, he [is the man]," it would be easy to take the words as "And he said to Judas, *Art thou betraying the man* whom thou kissest?" Either by Hebrew or by Greek corruption "man" might easily become "son of man."<sup>1</sup> Thus the words fall into the shape now extant in Luke.

[477] Matthew, as has been pointed out (188), assigns to Jesus a reply impossible, in its Greek shape—because "companion" implies a jesting or ironical mood that is quite out of place here—but possibly derived from a tradition found in John, bidding Judas do his evil deed with despatch.<sup>2</sup>

### § 62. *The wounding of the High priest's servant*

Mk. xiv. 47.

Mt. xxvi. 51.

Lk. xxii. 49, 50.

"But [a certain] one of them - that - stood - by having drawn - for - himself (*σπασάμενος*) (?) the [*i.e.* his] sword struck the servant of the high priest."

"And behold one of those with Jesus having stretched out his hand wrested away (*ἀπέσπασεν*) his (*αὐτοῦ*) sword, and having smitten the servant of the high priest."

"But seeing what would follow, those around him said, 'Lord, Shall we smite with the sword?' And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest."

#### (i) "strike" and "smite"

[478] "Smite," the word used by Matthew and Luke, occurs in the Septuagint about 420 times, Mark's "strike"

<sup>1</sup> [476*b*] In "the man whom," the relative might easily drop out after "man" (אִישׁ after אִישׁ) as it does in 2 S. xxi. 5. Or the original of Mk. might contain כִּי "when," or "if" ("If I kiss a man, he[is the person]"): and כִּי might be read as בֶּן "son." Also, by Gk. corruption, "the man (accus.) whom," *ανθρωπῶν* might easily be taken as *ανθρωπου* *i.e.* *ανθρώπου υἱόν*, the latter word being misplaced.

<sup>2</sup> [477*a*] If Judas said to his Master "Peace (*shlm*)," a tradition may have arisen, right or wrong, that Jesus replied to him in some similar word. Now (*a*) "man - of - my - peace" means "intimate friend," (*b*) the verb (*shlm*) means "accomplish," "complete" (once = *σπουδάσω*). (*b*) The latter might be the basis of John's tradition (Jn. xiii. 27) "Do quickly what thou art doing." Matthew may have conflated the two.

about 25. Both words *might* describe an accidental blow ; but, considering the proportion of usage, we may say that "strike" is more often thus used, while "smite" expresses military slaughter, the visitations of God, etc.<sup>1</sup> Did Mark's Corrector substitute "smite" because he considered it a word of higher tone? Or did he wish to avoid the notion that the blow was a casual one? This question will be considered below.

(ii) "*they that stood by*"

[479] Mark's "they-that-stood-by" occurs repeatedly in the Septuagint meaning "attendants"; and whenever in the New Testament the participle is preceded by the article, it ought probably to be rendered by some phrase implying attendance, *e.g.* (Lk. xix. 24) where a nobleman bids his "attendants" take away the pound from the idle servant, (Acts xxiii. 2) where the high priest commands one of the "attendants" to smite Paul, (Jn. xviii. 22) where "one of the officers *in attendance*" struck Jesus, (Lk. i. 19) "I am Gabriel the [angel] that is [ever] *in attendance* before God," (Mk. xv. 35) "Some of the men *on guard*, when they heard it said, Behold he calleth Elijah," (Mk. xv. 39) "the centurion that was *on guard* over against him." So, too, when the word is used twice by Mark (xiv. 69, 70) in Peter's denial, it is best translated, "those in attendance," *i.e.* the soldiers and servants who were on duty, or in waiting, in the courtyard. Hence *the most natural meaning of Mark's words here is, "One of the attendants drawing his sword [accidentally] struck the servant of the high priest."*

[480] Thus, too, and thus only, can we explain Mark's mentioning "*the sword*" here without any previous mention.

<sup>1</sup> For *παλειν* ("strike"), see Josh. xx. 9, 2 S. xiv. 6. In Dan. viii. 7, Theod. gives *παλειν*, LXX *παράσσειν* "smite," for the butting of a goat. In Numb. xxii. 28 (נכה), the ass says *τι . . . διεπράκας*; in Numb. xxii. 32 (נכה), the angel says *τι ἐπύραξας*;



Peter could not be expected to carry a sword about with him.<sup>1</sup> If, therefore, Peter had been meant, the writer would hardly have used "the." But any-one of the temple-guard, or armed attendants, or Roman soldiers on duty, would naturally have a sword; and, in speaking of such a one, a writer would naturally use the article, to mean "his" (as it is used in Greek or French, when applied to limbs, clothing, etc.).<sup>2</sup>

If however it is the fact that Mark understood the blow to have been accidentally struck by one of the guards, it does not necessarily follow that he is correct, or even that he represents the original Gospel. The Hebrew word meaning "attendants" may possibly have been applied in early times to some or all of the Apostles who had "stood fast" by Jesus in His "temptations."<sup>3</sup> However, the question is not at present whether Mark is right, but what were the motives and processes involved in Matthew's and Luke's departures from Mark, including their adoption of the word "smite" instead of "strike"; and enough has been said to shew that one motive may have been the desire to shew that the wounding of the high priest's servant was not accidental, but the deliberate act of a disciple. From this motive, we may also explain the substitution of Matthew's "those with Jesus" and Luke's "those around him" for Mark's "those in attendance."

<sup>1</sup> Some of the Galilaean pilgrims may have occasionally carried swords. But that the practice was not habitual appears from Lk. xxii. 36-38, which says that there were only "two swords" among the whole of the disciples. Jn. xviii. 10 ("Simon Peter *having* a sword") implies that the "having" was casual.

<sup>2</sup> [480a] That μάχαυρα here means "sword" and not "(cooking) knife," is demonstrated by a consensus of Biblical use in the former meaning, so frequent as to make it certain that it could not be used for knife, unless something in the context necessitated the latter meaning. Μάχαυρα occurs in some Biblical books (e.g. Jeremiah) far more often than ρομφαία, in the sense "sword"; and it is used in N.T. even of the official sword (Acts xii. 2, Rom. xiii. 4).

<sup>3</sup> [480b] Luke xxii. 28 διαμεμενηκότες. The word עמד "stand" may mean "stand-fast." One form of it also means "pillar." And we know from St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 9) that Peter was one of those who were "reputed to be pillars."



## (iii) "wrested away"

[481] But why does Matthew use "wrested away" instead of "drew"?<sup>1</sup> Perhaps for this reason. Some Editor of Mark, believing that the wound was inflicted by a disciple, and seeking to explain how a disciple of Jesus could possess a sword, wished to read Mark's account thus: "A certain man, *from* (or, *of*) *those standing by*, *wresting away* a sword," *i.e.* "wresting away a sword *from* those standing by (*i.e.* the soldiers)." This interpretation might be justified by the Hebrew Original, because the Hebrew "from" might mean either "from [the hands of]" or "[one] from [the number of]." But Mark's use of the Middle Voice—mostly implying "drawing" *one's own* sword—was incompatible with the Editor's view. He therefore changed the voice from Middle to Active. Matthew accepted the Editor's "wrested away"; but at the same time he rendered the preposition as "of"

<sup>1</sup> [481a] Ἀποσπᾶν, "wrest away," occurs in LXX ten times, but never in the sense of drawing a sword. In non-Hebraic Greek—except in the sense of "drawing off" soldiers, or "journeying"—it almost always implies violence, or involuntary motion. See Hemsterhuys's note on Lucian *Deor. Dial.* xx. 5, the substance of which is not adequately given by L. and S.

In the LXX, σπώμενος (the middle) is very frequently used for "[one] drawing sword," *i.e.* a swordsman, and (less frequently) for "drawing one's sword." The active means drawing some one else's sword, when Abimelech says to his servant (Judg. ix. 54) "draw my sword."

On the other hand, an insertion of the LXX, Ps. cli. 7, uses the middle, σπασόμενος, for David drawing Goliath's sword, and Sir. xxii. 21 has the active (σπάσῃς) for drawing one's sword against a friend. The active is also used for one's own sword in Judg. viii. 20 (unless εσπασατορο has been corrupted to εσπασέτο). The active is used of God drawing a sword in Ezek. xxvi. 15 ἐν τῷ σπάσαι μάχαιραν, "in the [time of] drawing the sword" = R.V. "when the slaughter is made." Ἐκσπᾶν (active) is used of drawing a sword with difficulty out of a wound (Judg. iii. 22), of David drawing Goliath's heavy sword out of its sheath, 1 S. xvii. 51 (B om., Α ἐξεπασεν (*sic*)), and of God drawing His sword of vengeance once for all, Ezek. xxi. 3, 5 ("it shall not return again"). It is not used, as σπώμενος is, to denote the regular drawing of the sword.

If, therefore, a writer wished to express "drawing a sword," he had σπᾶν and ἐκσπᾶν, active and middle, at his disposal; but, so far as Hemsterhuys and the LXX enable us to judge, he could not rightly use the active of ἀποσπᾶν.

(not "from") and interpreted "those standing by" as "those *with Jesus*." He also inserted "stretching out his hand"—probably in order to emphasize his view, namely, that the act was not a casual one. But the result makes no sense, unless we can suppose "his" to have a prospective reference: "wrested away *his* sword and smote the high priest's servant [with the servant's own sword]."

[482] Luke's narrative cannot at present be satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis of borrowing from Mark's tradition: but there are some indications of a possible Greek corruption.<sup>1</sup>

§ 63. (*Mk.*) "*the Son of the Blessed*," (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*the Son of God*"

Mk. xiv. 61 (lit.).

Mt. xxvi. 63.

Lk. xxii. 67, 70.

"Thou art the Christ the Son of the Blessed?"

"... that thou *tell* us if thou art the Christ the Son of God."

"If thou art the Christ *tell us*.'... But they all said, Thou art therefore the Son of God?"

[483] It has been shewn (371-2) that (1) this is one of many passages where Mark, having followed the Hebrew

<sup>1</sup> [482a] Luke omits *σπασάμενος*, but has (xxii. 49) τὸ ἐσόμενον, a participle that does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and occurs only thrice in the whole of the O.T. historical books. In one of these cases it is a corrupt repetition (only in E) from (Gen. xli. 30) πλησμονῆς. In Sir. xlii. 19, B has ἐπεσόμενα. In Eccles. x. 14 "what shall come to pass (הַיִּהְיֶה)" is rendered *עַל* τὸ γενόμενον. (In Lk. xxii. 49 D has *γενόμενον* instead of ἐσόμενον.)

[482b] Parallel to Matthew's *ἰδοῦ* Luke has *ἰδόντες*, perhaps having read *ἰδον* as *ἰδον* (i.e. *εἶδον* "they saw") (see 352a). But *ἰδον* is twice (Job xxiii. 4, Esth. v. 2 (Oxf. Conc.)) confused by scribes of κ with *ἰπον*, i.e. *εἶπον*. Luke may have had before him two traditions, (i) one that the disciples "saw" (*ἰδον*), (ii) another that they "said" (*ἰπον*). Corresponding to (i), *σπασάμενος* might become *τοεπισόμενον*, or *τοεσομενῶ*: corresponding to (ii) it might become *ειπεσόμεν*, i.e. *ἐπαισόμεν* "shall we strike" (altered into *ἐπιδάξομεν*). [D has *επεσεν* for *επαισεν* in Mk., and *επεσεν* is in Judg. xiv. 19 (A), Jer. v. 6 (κAB), 2 K. xxv. 21 (A).]

[482c] But see below (Mk. xiv. 65) (486) where Mt. and Lk. insert "who struck thee?"—possibly parallel to Mk.'s "officers."

closely, has not expressed the interrogative so clearly as to satisfy later Evangelists, (2) "the Blessed" is probably a mistake (414). Matthew and Luke—though in very different ways, and with obvious independence of each other—have adopted corrections of Mark on these points.

§ 64. (*Mt.*) "*from this moment*," (*Lk.*) "*from the present time*," *Mk.* omits

*Mk.* xiv. 62.

"But Jesus said, I am, and ye shall see the Son of man seated . . ."

*Mt.* xxvi. 64.

"Jesus saith to him, Thou hast said; however (*πλήν*) I say (*λέγω*) to you, from this moment (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) ye shall see the Son of man seated . . ."

*Lk.* xxii. 67–70.

"But he said to them, If I say (*εἶπω*) to you . . . but (*δέ*) (*λέγω*) from the present time (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*) the Son of man shall be seated . . . But he said unto them, Ye say that I am."

(i) (*Mt.*–*Lk.*) "*I say*"

[484 (i)] Confusion appears to have arisen here from the Hebrew "I [am]" represented in Mark's original by a long and emphatic form of the first personal pronoun. As a rule, in reply to the question "Art thou?" a shorter form of the pronoun is thus used.<sup>1</sup> The LXX so very frequently errs by rendering this long form "I am" instead of "I" that there is a strong antecedent probability that Mark has made a similar error and that Matthew and Luke have independently adopted corrections of it.

In a passage of Isaiah, the long form of "I" is corrupted

<sup>1</sup> [484 (i) a] The long form (*אני*) is often used antithetically to other pronouns. It is always emphatic. But it is never used in reply to the question "Art thou . . .?" except in 2 S. ii. 20: elsewhere *אני* is used, Gen. xxvii. 24, Judg. xiii. 11, 2 S. xx. 17, 1 K. xiii. 14, xviii. 8. Yet, although *אני* = only once *ἐγώ* *εἰμι* "I am [he]" in reply, it is in other contexts translated erroneously "I am" about fifteen times by the LXX, e.g. 2 S. xxiv. 12 "I offer thee," LXX "I am" "I lay upon thee," ib. 17 "I have sinned," LXX "I am I have sinned," etc.



to "say," to which it is somewhat similar.<sup>1</sup> "Say" may have been dropped here by Mark owing to a confusion with "I," and may have been replaced by Matthew and Luke, but in different contexts: "*However* I say to you," "*If* I tell you." It is extremely improbable that a direct avowal of Messiahship from Jesus to the high priest should have existed in the earliest gospel and be omitted by later gospels unless it was thought that the tradition was erroneous.

(ii) (*Mt.*) "*However*," (*Lk.*) "*If*"

[484 (ii)] Not only is the longer form of "I" capable of being confused with "say," but further, the last two letters of this form of "I," taken with the first two of "say," produce the Hebrew "but if," which may also be rendered "only," or "however." This may explain Matthew and Luke's divergence.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [484 (i) *δ*] Is. xxi. 8 "O Lord, *I* (אנכי) stand," LXX "the Lord said (leg. אמר, I stood." Comp. the LXX (Luc.) of 2 S. xx. 17, where Joab, in answer to a woman's request "Hear," says "*I* (אנכי) hear" (perhaps meaning "*I* hear [speak *thou*]") the pronoun being emphatic. The literal rendering is, "And he said, Hearing (שמע) *I-for-my-part* (אנכי) [*am*]. And she said (אמרה) saying (לאמר) . . . ." The LXX has, "And Joab said, I hear *I am*. And she said saying (Ἀκούω ἐγὼ εἰμι. καὶ εἶπεν λέγουσα)." But Luc. has "And he said *I* hear, say [*ou*]. And she said (καὶ εἶπεν Ἀκούω ἐγὼ, λέγε. Καὶ εἶπε)." Probably Luc. does not conflate "I" with "say," but conflates "and she said" as "thou shalt say," *i.e.* "say on": but in any case the passage well illustrates the confusions that might arise from an original containing repetitions of "say."

Suppose the original to have been "*I* (אנכי) say (אמר particip.) that (כי) ye (emph.) (אתם) shall see." In that case, Mk., rendering "I" as "I am," and dropping אמר as a corrupt repetition of אנכי, would give nearly what is now extant in Mk. "I am [and] ye shall see."

[484 (i) *c*] The facts connected with Christ's use of "*I am* (ἐγὼ εἰμι)" during the Passion are these. Mk. alone gives it as uttered to the high priest in answer to the question, "Art thou the Christ?" Lk. (xxii. 70) has "ye say that I am" (in answer to "Art thou the Son of God?" But in answer to "Art thou the Christ?" Lk. has "If I say to you . . ."). Mt. has, parallel to Mk., merely "Thou hast said but I say." In Jn., when the Jews say "[We seek] Jesus of Nazareth," Jesus replies (Jn. xviii. 5) "*I am* [he] (ἐγὼ εἰμι)," and (Jn. xviii. 8) "*I* said to you that *I am* [he]."

<sup>2</sup> [484 (ii) *a*] πλὴν (Mt.'s word) = אמ כי (3), but אמ כי also means "But if." If the original had אנכי ("I"), followed by אמר ("say"), the letters כי followed by אמ might be rendered by Mt. πλὴν and by Lk. ἐάν.



(iii) (*Mk.—Mt.*) “*ye shall see*,” (*Lk.*) “*shall be*”

[484 (iii)] The extreme difficulty of Matthew’s version (“ye shall see,” combined with “from *this moment*”) indicates that it must have been forced on him by adherence to a supposed original (but see 485). Luke’s text points to a Hebrew variation between “be” and “see”; and such variations, either through confusion or through paraphrase, occur in Kings, Isaiah, and Job.<sup>1</sup> Or, the Original may have been, as Luke has it, “there shall be,” accompanied by some words that might be taken to mean (a) “in your sight,” “before your face,” or else (b) “from this time”; and Mark may have rendered “there shall be before your face” freely, “ye shall see.”<sup>2</sup>

(iv) (*Mt.*) “*From this moment*,” (*Lk.*) “*from the present time*”

[484 (iv)] The Hebrew “now,” like our English “now,” is sometimes used as an enclitic throwing emphasis on the preceding word, “*come now*,” *i.e.* “therefore *come*,” but sometimes emphatically, “*come now*” *i.e.* at the present time. In the former sense, the Hebrew is sometimes rendered in Greek by “and (*καί*).” Mark may here have taken it in that sense.

But the Hebrew “now” is also liable to be confused with “thou,” and (though less probably) with “ye.” Strictly

<sup>1</sup> “Be” = היה, “see,” in the sense of “behold,” sometimes = חזה. Comp. Is. ii. 1 “saw (חזה),” *γεγόμενος* (leg. היה), Job. viii. 17 “beholdeth (חזה),” *ᾔσασται* (leg. היה “live,” which is confused with היה in 1 K. xvii. 22). Or Luke may have rendered the passive of ראה “see” by “be” as the LXX has done in 2 K. xxiii. 24 “were *spied* (נראו),” *γεγονότα*. The passage is ins. by LXX in 2 Chr. xxxv. 19a with *ἦν* instead of *γεγονότα*. In Is. xxxiii. 11 “ye shall conceive (חברו)” LXX has *ᾤψασθε* (leg. ראה for חזה).

<sup>2</sup> In Is. xxx. 8 “*before* them,” *i.e.* “in their presence” (אתם), is rendered *ταῦτα*, and in Gen. xx. 16 (R.V. txt. “*in respect of* all,” marg. “*before* all”), את is regarded by LXX as sign of accus., *πάντα*: in Mic. vi. 1 “*before* (אח) the mountains,” LXX has *πρός*. But this idiom (instead of the usual “*before the face of*”) is very rare, nor could אחכם (even if used to mean “*before* you”) be easily confused with סעתי “from this time.”

speaking, as the high priest alone questioned Jesus, "thou" and not "ye" should be used in the reply. In Luke there is no difference of singular and plural because he makes the "priests," and not the high priest, question Jesus. Some insertion of "thou" or "ye" in the margin, being confused with "now," might possibly account for the introduction of the latter,<sup>1</sup> which, when preceded by a single Hebrew letter (ח), would become "from this moment," or "from the present time." Hence may have arisen, in Hebrew, a correction of Mark, adopted (in substance though in different shapes) by Matthew and Luke: but there is not evidence enough to justify a confident conclusion.

[485] Compare a similar variation—but in a negative sentence—in the account of the Last Supper:

Mk. xiv. 25.

Mt. xxvi. 29.

Lk. xxii. 18.

"Verily I say to you that no longer assuredly (οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ) will I drink."

"But I say to you, Assuredly I will not (οὐ μὴ) drink from this moment."

"For I say to you, Assuredly I will not (οὐ μὴ) drink from the present time."

When Isaiah (xlviii. 6) writes "I have shewed thee new things *from this time*," the adverb seems to have an emphatic rather than a temporal signification, "*absolutely* new." Regard being had to the use of Matthew's phrase in Greek literature, it seems quite possible that Matthew's "from this moment" meant "*absolutely*" and was intended by the writer to be taken, both here and in the passage quoted above, with "I say to you." Luke has here committed himself to a temporal meaning. Mark, translating freely, may have omitted the particle as merely denoting

<sup>1</sup> [484 (iv) α] "Now" = נחמ, "thou" = אתה : א and י are freq. (4 (a) iii) interchanged. In 2 S. xviii. 3, Heb. has "now," but LXX and R.V. ("with ancient authorities") "thou"; 1 Chr. xxviii. 9 "thou," LXX "now." In Gen. xiii. 14, "thou" is confl. by LXX, "now thou."

emphasis, or may have expressed it by "verily," which he connects with "I say."<sup>1</sup>

But another hypothesis is suggested by the negative character of this passage, which differentiates it from the one discussed in 484. In five passages of O.T., where the Hebrew has "not," *applied to an action, or state, that is discontinued* ("I will *not* [any longer] give," "the rain was *not* poured [any longer] on the earth," "I am *not* [any more living]," etc.), the LXX has "no longer (*οὐκέτι*)"—as the Greek idiom, and we may almost say the English, demands. By analogy, we may suppose that in the Hebrew original of the present passage there was no adverb of time, but that Mark inserted "no longer," which later Correctors independently changed to more emphatic forms.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [485a] In the parallel to Mt. xxiii. 39 "For I say to you, Ye shall *assuredly* not see me *henceforth* (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) until ye say," Lk. xiii. 35 has "[but brack. by W. H.] I say to you, Ye shall *assuredly* not see me until ye say," omitting "henceforth," though the context agrees with Mt. almost verbatim. SS, in Lk., has "until *it come that* ye say." Diatessaron has, "*Verily* I say unto you ye shall not see me henceforth," where "verily" cannot be explained from the Greek of Mt. or of Lk.; but it may be the result of a conflation of the Greek or Hebrew meanings of a Heb. word translated "henceforth."

[485b] 'Απ' ἄρτι does not occur in LXX. "Ἀρτι occurs only in Judith (1), Macc. (9), and twice in the LXX version of Daniel where Theodotion has *νῦν*. In Dan. x. 17 (lit.) "But as for me (אני) from-now (מעתה) there remaineth not (or, will not remain) (אין לי) in me strength," Theod. translates literally so as to give the meaning, "I shall have no more strength all my life," (R.V. "*straightway* there remained no strength"): but "*absolutely* no strength" would also make sense.

[485c] In Herodotus, ἀπ' ἄρτι (perh. to be written ἀπαρτί) means "exactly." In comic authors (but perhaps mostly or always with μάλλον, μὲν οὖν, ἀλλὰ etc.) it may mean "quite the contrary." On Aristoph. *Plut.* 388 Brunck (Lobeck's *Phryn.* p. 21) quotes ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν as a gloss on ἀπ' ἄρτι. Comp. 2 S. xv. 34 ἀπρίως καὶ νῦν a conflate for "now (עתה)." In Aristoph. *Plut.* 388 ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς μόνους Ἀπαρτί πλουτῆσαι ποιήσω, I would suggest ΜΕΝΟΥ for ΜΟΝΟΥΣ. In Rev. xiv. 13 "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord *from-henceforth* (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) Yea (*ναί*) saith the Spirit," the rendering should perhaps be "Absolutely yea," i.e. "Yes indeed."

<sup>2</sup> For insertions of *οὐκέτι* in negative sentences in LXX, see Ex. v. 10, ix. 33, Ps. xxxix. 13, Job vii. 8, 21.



§ 65. (*Mt.-Lk.*) "*Who is it that struck thee?*" *Mk. omits*

*Mk. xiv. 65.*

*Mt. xxvi. 67, 68.*

*Lk. xxii. 63-65.*

[486] "And some began to spit on him and to cover his face and to buffet him and to say unto him, Prophecy, and the officers (?) took <sup>1</sup> him with blows-of-their-hands (*lit.* blows with the flat of the hand)."

"Then they spat on his face and buffeted him; but others (*οἱ δέ*) gave him-blows-with-their-hands (*lit.* with the flat of the hand), saying, Prophecy unto us, Christ, *Who is it that struck thee?*"

"And the men that were guarding (*συνέχοντες*) him mocked (*imperf.*) him, beating him, and having covered him, they asked (*imperf.*) him saying, Prophecy, *who is it that struck thee?* And many other things, reviling, they said against him."

(i) (a) *Who mocked Jesus?*

[487 (i) (a)] Before investigating the origin of Matthew's and Luke's "*who is it that struck thee?*" the context must be carefully examined. And the first question that presents itself is, *Who* mocked Jesus before the sentence of death pronounced by Pilate?

Here, Mark replies "some," and "the officers." Matthew—who has recently mentioned the Sanhedrim—now describes the mockers as "they" (expressed, not by a pronoun, but by a verb in the third person plural), and then as (?) "others" (*οἱ δέ*). Luke says here "the men that were guarding (*συνέχοντες*) him." Later on, Luke, and he alone,

<sup>1</sup> [486a] (R.V. txt.) "*Received him with blows of their hands,*" *ῥαπισμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον*, is satisfactory as a popular rendering; but it does not express the fact that the Greek is as harsh as it would be in Shakespeare to say "I took him with a box on the ear" instead of "I took him a box on the ear." Many MSS. of course alter *ἔλαβον* into *ἔβαλον* (a common variation in the LXX); but the genuineness of *ἔλαβον* is confirmed by many considerations and especially by *Acts of John*, ch. iv. *ἢ ἐλ ῥαπισμασὶν με ἔλαβες*; Dr. J. B. Mayor suggests to me, as a parallel, Plaut. *Aulul.* iv. 4. 3 "*miseris accipiam modis.*"



(xxiii. 11) describes a "setting at nought" by "Herod with his soldiers."

John describes Jesus as receiving a "blow" from "one of the officers" while being examined by the high priest, and as being scourged, and arrayed in a purple robe and crown of thorns by Pilate, and as receiving "blows" from "the soldiers."<sup>1</sup>

(i) (β) and (γ) *The Evangelic use of "some," "others" etc.*

[487 (i) (β)] The differences suggest that in the Original there was some obscurity about the personality of the perpetrators of these insults. Compare the answer of the disciples when Jesus asked them "who do men say that I am?"<sup>2</sup>

Mk. viii. 28.

"But they (οἱ δέ) (lit.) said to him saying that (ὅτι) *John the Baptist*, and others *Elijah*, but others that (ὅτι) *One of the prophets . . .*"

Mt. xvi. 14.

"But they (οἱ δέ) said, 'SOME (οἱ μὲν) *John the Baptist*, but others *Elijah*, but others-again (ἕτεροι)<sup>3</sup> *Jeremiah* or *one of the prophets.*'"

Lk. ix. 19.

"But they (οἱ δέ) answering said, '*John the Baptist*, but others *Elijah*, but others that (ὅτι) *Some prophet of the ancients hath risen up.*'"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jn., in both cases (xviii. 22, xix. 3), has "gave a blow (or, blows) with the flat of the hand," using the same noun (πάπισμα, lit. "slap" (492-3)) as that in Mk. But R. V. (txt.) has, in Jn., "struck him with his hand (or, their hands)," but in Mk., "received him with blows of their hands," thereby concealing the identity of the noun. The blows and other insults, in Jn., precede the sentence of death pronounced by Pilate in Jn. xix. 16.

<sup>2</sup> In what follows, the words of "men," as reported by the disciples, are italicized, in order to save a third set of inverted commas. It is important to notice that the disciples are not reporting their own opinion, as Winer (487 (i) (β) δ) appears to assume.

<sup>3</sup> [487 (i) (β) α] "Others-again (ἕτεροι)": this word, when contrasted with ἄλλοι ("others"), implies "others of a different sort."

<sup>4</sup> [487 (i) (β) δ] On the use of οἱ δέ in Lk. ("but they (οἱ δέ) answering") Winer (§ iii. 18, p. 131) says, "In Lk. ix. 19 οἱ δέ would regularly refer to the μαθηταί mentioned in the preceding verse, and would indicate that all [the

Matthew's "some" is here required by the sense. The repetition, "said *saying*," is very unusual in Mark.<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew given by Delitzsch in Matthew for "some say" is "some (lit. there-are-some) (𐤔) *saying*." The facts suggest that this, preceded by "they said," was also the Hebrew original of Mark, and that "some" was dropped, or replaced by "to him," so as to result in "they said to him saying that . . ." <sup>2</sup>

[487 (i) (γ)] Compare also the remarks in John (ix. 8, 9) uttered by the neighbours of the man born blind: "The neighbours, therefore, and those-who-[used-to]-behold (οἱ θεωροῦντες) him before . . . began to say, 'Is not this he that used to sit and beg?' (R.V.) *Others* (ἄλλοι) began-to-say that (ὅτι) 'This is he.' (R.V.) *Others* (ἄλλοι) began-to-say 'No, but it is like him.'" Here the sense seems to require that the two classes called by R.V. "others" should be included in the class previously mentioned, who "used-to-behold." For, if they had not thus "beheld" him, how could they say "it is he," or "it is like him"?

disciples] returned the answer which follows; but from ἄλλοι δέ . . . ἄλλοι δέ, it is clear that it was given by a part only."

The context shews that οἱ δέ *does* mean *all* the disciples, in Lk., as in Mk.—Mt. They *all* "answered" Jesus, stating the several opinions of the people. Lk.'s meaning—as an answer to the question, "Who do the multitudes say that I am?"—might be paraphrased thus: "[The multitudes say, mostly,] John, but others [of the multitudes say] Elijah . . ." Lk. simply follows Mk. in omitting "Some say," or "Most say," before "John the Baptist." The Gospel perhaps tacitly contrasts the readiness of all the disciples to report what the multitudes said about Jesus with their silence (broken by Peter alone) when Jesus added, "But who say *ye* that I am?"

<sup>1</sup> [487 (i) (β) c] The only other instance of "said saying" in Mk. is Mk. xii. 26 πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων, before a quotation from Scripture.

<sup>2</sup> [487 (i) (β) d] The phrases "some said," "others said," are very rare in O.T. But in Neh. v. 2-4 they occur with a combination of the relative and the participle, thus: "[There-were] some who [were] saying (אֲמַר אִישׁ וְאֶחָד), " *ἦσαν*, or *εἰσιν*, *τινες λέγοντες*, thrice repeated. "Jeremiah" (ירמיה), in Mt. xvi. 14, might be a corruption arising from (Delitzsch) אֲמַר יֵרֵמְיָהּ: but more probably it springs from some gloss (Deut. xviii. 15, Acts iii. 22) containing ῥος, with ῥος and other variants, resulting in Lk. (α<sub>1</sub>) ἀρχαίων (ῥος) (α<sub>2</sub>) ἀνέστη (ῥος). Dan. ix. 2 (LXX) ἐγγεῖραι probably conflates "Jeremiah" as ῥος.

Probably therefore "others . . . others" should be connected with the preceding class and rendered, as often in Greek and Latin, "some" and "others," the meaning being, in effect, "Those who knew the man well began in amazement to ask one another whether this was not the blind man; and *some* [of them] said positively that it was, *others* [of them] that it was like him."<sup>1</sup>

(i) (δ) "*but they* (οἱ δέ)," when used for "*but others*"

[487 (i) (δ)] The Greek article (οἱ), with δέ (δέ meaning "but" or "in the second place"), can be used without a noun, in two senses:—(i) antithetically, after the article with μέν (μέν meaning "in the first place"). Thus used, in opposition to "some in the first place," it means "others in the second place," *i.e.* "but others."

(ii) Without this antithesis, οἱ δέ must, as a rule, refer to a class just mentioned, and must mean "but they," *i.e.* the people last mentioned.

Sometimes, however—even where there is no antithesis, and where οἱ δέ ought strictly to mean "but they"—it is used to mean "but others," loosely, as follows: "The captives . . . had gone to Decelēa [, or rather, I should have said, some and indeed most of them] *but others* (οἱ δέ) to Megara."<sup>2</sup> This construction, which is extremely rare, appears to be limited to instances where *an exception is added as an after-thought*. There are only two instances of it alleged by Winer from N.T. Both are in Matthew. One of these (xxvi. 67) is now under consideration. The other will be mentioned in the next paragraph.

<sup>1</sup> SS and the Arabic Diatessaron also render it thus, and so does the English Authorized Version.

<sup>2</sup> See Jelf's Gk. Gr. § 767. 2, quoting Xen. *Hell.* i. 2. 14 given above, and Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 5. 46 ὁρᾶτε ἵππους ὅσοι ἡμῶν πάρεσιν [*i.e.* οἱ μὲν πλείστοι ἤδη παρόντες] οἱ δὲ προσάγονται.



(i) (ε) "*but some doubted*"

[487 (i) (ε)] These words occur in Matthew's account of the Resurrection, "But the eleven disciples went to Galilee to the mountain where Jesus [had] made appointment for them. And having seen him they-worshipped, *but some* (?) (οἱ δέ) doubted."<sup>1</sup> Concerning this remarkable and important statement Winer says, "We have first the general statement . . . : that this, however, refers only to the greater part is clear from the words which follow [*i.e.* *but some doubted*]." But (i) in dealing with so small a number as "eleven," is it likely that Matthew would make a "general statement" that was not true, omitting the fact that at least two out of eleven "doubted" and then adding it as an afterthought without telling us whether the doubters were two, or more than two? There are circumstances, in the context and elsewhere, that suggest that the text may be corrupt, and that "some" does not mean "some of the eleven."<sup>2</sup>

(i) (ξ) Mt. "*but others* (οἱ δέ)," as used here

[487 (i) (ξ)] Returning to the account of the Passion, and to Matthew's peculiar phrase ("but others") we note

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxviii. 16, 17 οἱ δὲ ἑνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν. SS is lost. Arab. Diatess. has "but there were of them who doubted."

<sup>2</sup> [487 (i) (ε) α] (1) "The eleven" is never used with "disciples" except here (it occurs absolutely in Mk.-App. xvi. 14, Lk. xxiv. 9, 33, Acts ii. 14, and with "apostles" in Acts i. 26). (2) "And," either in Heb. (וְ), or in Gk. (καί), could easily be dropped (especially in Gk. here, καὶ coming after -κα): so that the original might have been "The eleven *and* [ ] disciples," the blank containing some number. (3) In Gk., ἦσαν may have originally existed in the text, and may easily have been dropped after -ησαν. If so, the original Greek might be ἦσαν δὲ οἱ, *i.e.* "but *there were some* [present, not the eleven] who doubted." (4) The passage, regard being had to the context, reminds one of 1 Cor. xv. 6 "but some *are fallen asleep* (Delitzsch 睡)." The verb 睡, "sleep," means also to be "changeable," "fickle" (*e.g.* Prov. xxiv. 21), and it is possible that the tradition rightly taken by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6) as "but some slept" may have been misunderstood by the originator of Mt.'s tradition as meaning "but some oscillated, or doubted."



that he connects it with (lit.) "smiting with the flat of the hand," a vernacular phrase that can only be expressed exactly by the English word "slapping." Mark assigns this act to officers, but connects the noun "slap," in a very extraordinary way, with the verb "take" ("took him with slaps"). John assigns the act to "one" of "the officers" who gave Jesus a "slap" while He was being examined by the high priest. Luke omits the word "slap." But we shall find hereafter that it meant *a blow inflicted in mockery*, and Luke here assigns the act of "beating with mockery" (lit. "they kept mocking him, beating") to "the men that were guarding him."

We cannot feel sure of the exactness of the parallelism between Luke and Mark, because the former, who omits "spitting" here, may be paraphrasing that word in his word "mocking":<sup>1</sup> but a comparison of the four Gospels makes it reasonable to take as a working hypothesis the view that there may be a confusion between Mark's "some (τινες)" (which he may have conflated in the word "take"), Matthew's "others (οἱ δέ)," John's "one," and Luke's "guarding." If therefore Biblical Hebrew presents some word meaning (1) "guard," but also meaning (2) "take," and capable of being easily confused with (3) "some," and with (4) "others" (in the phrase "but others"), there will be a considerable probability that such a word represents the common Hebrew original of all these traditions.

Delitzsch gives, as the Hebrew of Luke's "guard," the word **קח**, i.e. "grasp," "take hold of." Now this word

<sup>1</sup> [487 (i) (f) a] There may be also Greek confusion. Comp. Job xvi. 10 "they have smitten (הכו) my cheek (יחי) *ἐπαισέν με εἰς τὰ γόνατα*," "he has smitten me *on the knees*," where "on the cheek (εἰς ἰαγῶνα)" must have been corrupted to εἰς ἰαγῶνα, and then γόνα (a form once found in A, 1 K. viii. 54) was completed as γόνατα. Possibly (but not probably, because of the rarity of *παλίσω*) *ἐπαισέν* is a corruption of *ἐπαίσαν*. In Judg. xvi. 25 "he made sport," LXX conflates (*a*<sub>1</sub>) *ἐπαίξεν* with (*a*<sub>2</sub>) *ἐπαίξον*, where A omits *a*<sub>1</sub>, and substitutes *ἐνέπαίξον* for *a*<sub>2</sub>.

(Gesen. Oxf.) is, in Aramaic, **אֶחָד**, *i.e.* "one," and it is confused with the latter (according to R.V.) in the Hebrew text of a passage in Chronicles, besides being confused with this and similar words in the Greek text of this and other passages of O.T.<sup>1</sup>

Let us suppose, then, that the original Hebrew stated, in connection with the examination of Christ by the high priest, that "*those who were holding Jesus in custody* began to mock him." Luke, translating the verb (**אָחַז**) correctly, placed the act before the examination. Mark took the word to be the rare plural of **אֶחָד** "one," and to mean "certain persons," or "some few," **אֶחָדִים**; and he placed the insults after the examination, but not so as to commit himself to the statement that the examiners themselves insulted Jesus.

But, in a conflation, Mark returned to the correct Hebrew (**אָחַז**), understanding it however not as "grasp" but as "take," and hence—giving a literal translation that may have coincided with some rare vernacular Greek idiom now lost—he presents us with the extraordinary expression "*took him with blows.*"<sup>2</sup>

Matthew's opening words ("then they spat") indicate that the insulters were the persons mentioned in the previous verse, *i.e.* the members of the council ("They answered and said, He is worthy of death"). His "then" (**אָחַז**)

<sup>1</sup> [487 (i) (j) δ] 1 Chr. xxiv. 6. The Heb. has "one father's house being taken for Eleazar and (lit.) *taken taken* for Ithamar," R.V. has "*one taken*," LXX "*one one* (εἷς εἷς)," in both cases. Comp. Gen. xxiv. 56 "Hinder (**אָחַז**)" *κατέχευε*, where LXX probably reads **אָחַז** (which=(11) *κατέχω*, whereas **אָחַז** is nowhere else thus rendered), Zech. xi. 14 "brotherhood (**אָחַז**)," *κατάσχεσιν* (leg. **אָחַז**). Esdr. viii. 79 has *ἐχοντες* (leg. **אָחַז**)=Ezr. ix. 10 "after (**אָחַז**)."

<sup>2</sup> [487 (i) (j) ε] The word **אָחַז** when rendered (5) *λαμβάνειν*, is mostly applied to panic "taking" people. But it is used in Job xvi. 12 to signify "taking by the neck," where LXX has "taking by the hair." It will be found that the only Hebrew word rendered "slap" by the LXX really meant "pulling out the hair." As regards the possibility of a Greek phrase "take with slaps," see the quotation from Suidas below (492a).

may be a corruption of the original  $\text{נָחַו}$ , "take," or "guard."<sup>1</sup> But when (perhaps conflating it) he connects  $\text{נָחַו}$  with the verb "slap," instead of repeating Mark's extraordinary phrase "took him with blows," he regards "taking,"  $\text{נָחַו}$ , as an error for  $\text{נָחַדִּים}$ , "some." Having, however, previously described one outrage, the "spitting," he now writes as though "some" perpetrated that and "some" this. Hence, he allows himself to use  $\text{οἱ δέ}$ ,<sup>2</sup> forgetful of the fact that  $\text{οἱ μὲν}$  does not precede, or, perhaps, transposing the clause bodily in Greek, without alteration, from a tradition like those in the *Acta Pilati* and *Pseudo-Peter*, where  $\text{οἱ δέ}$  actually occurs.<sup>3</sup>

Later Evangelists, finding a tradition that "certain persons ( $\text{נָחַדִּים}$ )," or "(men) guarding ( $\text{נָחַוִּים}$ )," mocked or smote Jesus, might be influenced by the fact that the former plural (lit. "ones") is of very rare occurrence in O.T., and is never used partitively.<sup>4</sup> If the two were conflated, it would be natural to take the final  $\text{-ם}$  of "ones" as meaning "from," or "of," so as to make the meaning "one of the men

<sup>1</sup> [487 (i) (ζ) d] This would be more probable if  $\text{τότε}$ , "then," were often found in the LXX as an error for other words. But it seems to be rare. Comp., however, an apparent Heb. error in 1 K. ix. 26 "a navy of ships ( $\text{נָוִי}$ )" = 2 Chr. viii. 17 "then ( $\text{וְאָנֹכִי}$ )," and Cant. viii. 10 "then ( $\text{וְאָנֹכִי}$ ),"  $\text{ἐγώ}$  (leg.  $\text{ἐγώ}$ ).  $\text{Τότε}$  only once (Lev. xxii. 7) =  $\text{נָחַו}$  (which (487 (i) (ζ) δ) is liable to be confused with  $\text{נָחַדִּים}$ ).

<sup>2</sup> [487 (i) (ζ) ε] This is more probable than that  $\text{οἱ μὲν}$  should have dropped out by Gk. corruption between  $\text{τότε}$  and  $\text{ἐνέπτυσαν}$ . For why should it drop out here any more than in Mt. xvi. 14 (487 (i) (β) γ)? D has  $\text{ἄλλοι δέ}$  for Mt.'s  $\text{οἱ δέ}$ , SS "and others smote him on the cheeks."

<sup>3</sup> [487 (i) (ζ) f] Later traditions of the insults after Pilate's condemnation subdivide the insulters, *Acta P.* (B) x. 1 "The Jews began to beat ( $\text{τύπτειν}$ ) Jesus, some ( $\text{οἱ μὲν}$ ) with staves, some ( $\text{οἱ δέ}$ ) with hands, some ( $\text{οἱ δέ}$ ) with feet; but some even ( $\text{οἱ δὲ καὶ}$ ) kept-spitting on his face," Gosp. Pet. § 3 "But they ( $\text{οἱ δέ}$ )" [referring to  $\text{αὐτοῖς}$  mentioned in § 1] "having taken the Lord . . . And a-certain-one ( $\text{τις}$ ) of them having brought a crown of thorns . . . and others-again ( $\text{ἕτεροι}$ ) . . . kept-spitting on his eyes, and others ( $\text{ἄλλοι}$ ) smote-with-the-palms-of-their-hands ( $\text{ἐπάτισαν}$ ) his cheeks: others-again ( $\text{ἕτεροι}$ ) kept-pricking him with a reed, and certain-persons ( $\text{τινες}$ ) began-to-scourge him."

<sup>4</sup> [487 (i) (ζ) g] The pl. of  $\text{נָחַו}$  occurs only 5 times in O.T. LXX omits it (1) (probably dropping  $\text{ἐν}$  in Ezek. xxxvii. 17  $\text{ἐσονται [ἐν] ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου}$ ), and renders it wrongly in Dan. xi. 20 "few days ( $\text{נָחַוִּים}$ )," LXX  $\text{ἐσχάταις}$  (leg.  $\text{ἐσχαταῖς}$ ). Theod.  $\text{ἐκελύσας}$ . Whatever may have induced so accurate a translator as Theod. to render it "those," the fact shows that the word presented difficulties.



guarding." This tradition—in the form "one of the officers, who was in attendance"—has been adopted by John.

(i) (η) *Conclusion*

[487 (i) (η)] In conclusion, the facts about Matthew's use of οἱ δέ indicate that it is not an idiomatic Greek usage such as has been quoted from Xenophon, but that it arises from a general confusion of the context in the Original, and, not improbably, from the insertion, in Matthew's text, of a clause that presupposes a previous mention of "some."

Also, it is probable, both for linguistic and for historical considerations, that Luke has preserved the truth as to the perpetrators of the outrages. Historically, it is more likely that the "guards," than that the chief priests, or any of the Sanhedrim, should have smitten Jesus with their hands immediately after, or before, the trial. Linguistically, it is more probable that the comparatively rare word "guard," "take," or "hold fast (ῥῆμα)," should be corrupted to "one (ἓνα)," or "some," than the contrary.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) (Mk.) "to spit upon him," (Mt.) "spat on his face,"  
(Lk.) "mocked him"

[488] Comparing this with Christ's final prediction about the Passion we find that there Mark and Luke insert "spitting," while Matthew (xx. 19) omits it. But all three there insert "mocking," which Luke alone inserts here.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [487 (i) (η) α] SS, in Mt. xxvi. 67, has "then they took him and spat in his face." This could be explained if the writer was restoring, and conflating, an original ῥῆμα, "take," which Mt. had rendered "then" (ἔπειτα).

<sup>2</sup> [488α] There are two previous predictions.<sup>3</sup> But the final one contains the following divergences: Mk. x. 34 ἐμπαῖξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν (DL ἐνπτύξουσιν) . . . μαστιγώσουσιν . . . ἀποκτενοῦσιν, Mt. xx. 19 εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, Lk. xviii. 32, 33 καὶ ἐμπαυχθήσεται καὶ ὕβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν. Here Lk.'s "shall be outraged and spit upon" suggests a conflate of the Hebrew word for "spit."

In Mk. x. 34, SS has "scourge . . . spit in his face . . . kill," D omits



Since Luke represents Jesus Himself as predicting the "spitting," he can hardly have omitted it here owing to a feeling that the detail was revolting. But the Hebrew word is rare, and therefore liable to be corrupted. Some corruption may have caused Matthew's omission of it above (xx. 19) and Luke's omission of it here. The verb occurs in only three passages of O.T.<sup>1</sup> In one of these it is rendered by Codex A "draw near." In another passage where the noun occurs, the R.V. gives "spit at the sight of me" as a marginal alternative to "spit in my face."<sup>2</sup> A similar doubt here between the two meanings might induce a translator of a Hebrew Gospel to give a general translation such as "mock." But the passage in O.T. most likely to influence Evangelists is the prediction of Isaiah that the Servant of Jehovah would not hide His face "from shames" (a word mostly meaning "reproaches") "and spitting." This the LXX renders "the shame of spittings," which exaggerates the stress laid on "spitting."<sup>3</sup> But others, considering that the expression meant "shames as of spitting," that is to say, not *words*, but revolting *acts*, might

"scourge and kill" (an omission that cannot be explained by homoiotel.), Diatess. has "treat shamefully, scourge, spit in his face, humble, crucify, and slay" (where Editor notes "humble" as "an obscure expression," perhaps a "repetition of the preceding clause"). D makes no sense, unless we suppose *ἐνπτύξουσιν* to be an irregular future of *ἐνπτύω*, or to represent an original "crucify" (? *ἐνπηξουσιν*). Aqu. renders *גרי*, one of the Hebr. words that might be used to express crucifixion, *ἀναπήξαι*.

It should be noted that Mt. alone represents Christ as predicting His death by *crucifixion*. Had Lk. accepted such a tradition he could hardly have failed to insert it. The facts suggest that Mt. has here read some Hebrew word that meant "spit" as meaning "pierce," "nail," or something implying "crucifixion."

<sup>1</sup> Numb. xii. 14, Deut. xxv. 9. In Lev. xv. 8 "*spit* (רָקַ) upon him," *ἐὰν δὲ προσεγγίσῃ*, A has *προσεγγίσῃ* (? leg. רָקַ, or Gk. corr.). In the present passage (Mk. xiv. 65, and parall.), no Gospel has "draw near," but Diatess. has "some of them *drew near* and *spat* on his face," which suggests a conflation.

<sup>2</sup> Job xxx. 10 "spit (lit. noun "spitting," רָקַ) in my face (פָּנַי)," marg. "at the sight of me," which agrees better with פָּנַי, and with context. But רָקַ is (371 and 158a) repeatedly confused with בָּ, which would certainly mean "in."

<sup>3</sup> Is. l. 6 *רָקַ מוֹסֵלֵם, אִשְׁחֹנֶה עִמְּנוּסָמָתָן*. The verb בָּלַם in hipl. = *ἀτιμάζω* (1), *καταλαλῶ* (1), *ἀτιμῶ* (1), etc.

consider the two Hebrew words best rendered by one Greek one, ἐμπαίγματα, which means "mockings" in the sense of "practical jokes."<sup>1</sup>

- (iii) (*Mk.*) "and to cover his face and to buffet him," (*Mt.*) " (on his face) and buffeted him," (*Lk.*) "beating him, and having covered him . . . reviling"

[489] The word "buffet" implies striking with the "fist," as distinct from "blows with the [flat] hand" mentioned afterwards. The two words for "fist" are similar (i) to "cover," (ii) to "revilings," and in one case the Septuagint renders "revilings" by "blows with the fist." Codex Bezae is now supported by SS as well as by the Arabic Diatessaron in omitting the "covering of the face" in Mark. It may have sprung from a mistranslation of the word meaning "fist."<sup>2</sup> But the question is complicated by other possibilities of misunderstanding detailed below.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [488<sup>b</sup>] It is possible, however, that some early Hebrew variation may have confused traditions about the "spitting" (קר, קרי, or קרי) with the Johannine tradition about "piercing." Barnabas, writing about the scapegoat, says (Barn. vii. 7) "Mark ye how the type of Jesus is made visible: 'And spit ye all on it, and pierce it.'" This combines the "spitting" with Zech. xii. 10 "they shall look on him whom they pierced (קר, Lexic. 'fig. curse, contemn')," κατωρχήσαντο, i.e. "danced over, triumphed over, insulted" (leg. קר). The same word (קר) is translated in Zech. xiii. 3 συμποδίζω, "bind," and in Is. xiii. 15 "shall be conquered."

The total of kindred confusions is considerable:—Lev. xv. 8 (quoted above) "spit (קר)" (A προσεγγίσῃ? leg. קר): Is. xl. 15 "dust (קר)" σέλος (leg. קר): Ps. xxix. 6 "maketh them to skip" (hiph. of קר) λεπτυνεῖ (leg. as from קר): 2 S. vi. 20 "vain fellows (קרי)" ὀρχουμένων (leg. as from קר).

<sup>2</sup> [489<sup>a</sup>] "Fist"=(i) קפ, which resembles קפ "cover." "Strike with the fist," κολαφίζω, does not occur in LXX, but is found in 1 Pet. ii. 20 as well as 1 Cor. iv. 11, 2 Cor. xii. 7. Κόλαφος is said by Hesychius to be synonymous with κόνδυλος; and κονδυλίζειν occurs in LXX paraphrases or additions in Amos ii. 7, Mal. iii. 5.

"Fist"=(ii) קריא. In Zeph. ii. 8, "revilings," or "blasphemings" (קרי) is rendered by LXX κονδυλισμοί (prob. leg. קריא). Gesen. Oxf. (p. 175<sup>b</sup>) says that Targums render קריא "staff."

<sup>3</sup> [489<sup>b</sup>] The tradition of "covering the face" in the sense of "blindfolding" may be a misunderstanding caused by blending the above-quoted words of

(iv) *Why does Mark omit "Who is it that struck thee"?*

[490] The Hebrew interrogative (מִי) of "*who struck?*" might easily be confused with the participial מֹכֵחַ (*i.e. m-*) of "*striking*," "*a striker*." Instead of "*officers*" in Mark, SS reads "*lictors*," and the Arabic Diatessaron "*soldiers*." Now part of the duty of "*the lictors*" was *to scourge*. The Original may have had "*scourgers*" or "*smiters*," paraphrased by Mark as "*officers*," by the Diatessaron as "*soldiers*," and translated by SS as "*lictors*."

The Original may have alluded, not to Isaiah's prediction "*I gave my back to the smiters*" (מַכִּים)—for the smiting of the *back*, *i.e.* the scourging, is described later on (Mk. xv. 15)—but to the Psalm describing how "*the objects* (נִכְחִים)" (a unique form of the verb in the Hebrew) "*gathered together, and I knew it not*." In the Psalm, most modern authorities agree with R.V. in taking "*objects*" passively, as "*smitten* (by God)," *i.e.* reprobates; but the LXX gives the same word both for "*smiters*" in Isaiah and for "*objects*" in the Psalm, viz. "*scourges*," probably meaning "*people scourging*."<sup>1</sup>

Isaiah (l. 6), "*shames* (כִּלְשָׁה) and spitting," with those of the Messianic Psalm (Ps. lxxix. 7) "*For thy sake I have borne reproach, shame* (כִּלְשָׁה) *hath covered my face*." Perhaps an early form of the narrative was to this effect, ambiguous without punctuation: "*They began to spit on him with shame his face was covered*." Mk., taking "*with shame*" to mean (as in the LXX) "*the shame of spitting*," wrote "*some began to spit on him and to cover his face [therewith, i.e. with the shame of spitting]*," never supposing that his words could be interpreted to mean "*blindfolding*." Mt., interpreting the words as Mk. did, omitted "*covering*" as ambiguous. Lk., taking the "*covering*" to mean "*blindfolding*," avoided the notion that the words could mean "*covered with spitting*" by expressing "*spitting*" in a general word "*(practical) mocking*" that could cause no ambiguity.

If Lk. is in error, it would seem highly probable that the tradition "*Who is it that struck thee?*"—which seems involved in the tradition of "*blindfolding*"—is also an error. But this must be considered below (490-1).

<sup>1</sup> Is. l. 6 "*I gave my back to (-ל-) smiters*" (מַכִּים), εἰς μαρτύριον, Ps. xxxv. 15 "*objects*" (marg. "*smiters*"), (נִכְחִים), μαρτύριον. No instance is alleged of μαρτύριον used (like μαρτύριον) to mean "*one worthy to be smitten*." As to the Psalmist's unique word, Gesen. Oxf. (p. 6466) says "rd. prob. נִכְחִים aliens."



The Psalmist's word is without the participial  $\text{-מ}$ , which the Prophet's word contains. Some marginal or (more probably) interlinear correction, suggesting the form with  $\text{-מ}$  as more correct, may have led to the confusion of  $\text{-מ}$  with  $\text{מי}$ , and to the conclusion that the word was to be taken interrogatively.<sup>1</sup>

[491] For instances of similar confusion there may be alleged a passage in Isaiah, where the Revised text has "who?" but the margin takes  $\text{-מ}$  as a prepositional prefix; and in Zephaniah "*that-which-is*" is rendered by the Septuagint "who?"<sup>2</sup> On the whole it seems probable that Mark—though abrupt, obscure, and paraphrastic—is right. If so, the original would seem to have been to this effect: "They said unto him that he should prophesy unto them and *the lictors, or smiters, or abjects* . . ." But the interrogative interpretation of the unique word "abjects" as "Who [are] smiting?" would have the advantage of harmonizing with the views of those who took the "covering" above mentioned to be a blindfolding. Besides, "that he should prophesy" (*i.e.* "Prophesy!") and "Who smote thee?" seemed to make an appropriate two-fold object to "they said." Indeed, Luke's sense is so complete that we cannot feel sure that he may not be right and Mark wrong. But, in any case, having regard to the very large number of other Synoptic passages where divergences can be explained by mistranslation, and to the instances of LXX mistranslations of participles, interrogatives, and other words special to

<sup>1</sup> The Original may have had the Psalmist's word נָמִים. Then the usual form, and the one used by Isaiah, might be written, in part or whole, above the line, with the article, as usual, prefixed (הַנָּמִים). If this was preceded by a word ending with final  $\text{-מ}$ , taken by a hasty reader as the interrogative, the result would be "who [are] the [men] smiting?"

According to Mt.-Lk. the preceding phrase is "Prophesy to us." In Reported Speech this would be "that he should prophesy to them (לָהֶם)." This would give a final  $\text{-מ}$  preceding "smite."

<sup>2</sup> [491a] Is. xlv. 24-5 (txt.) "Who [is] with me (מִי אִתִּי)?" but marg. "by myself (נִמְנָם)"; Zeph. iii. 18 "burden," lit. "*that which is lifted*," LXX  $\tau\iota\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu$ ;



this context, it is probable that Matthew's and Luke's agreement here against Mark is to be explained, not by the hypothesis of additional information, but by mistranslation in one or other of the Synoptists.<sup>1</sup>

(v) (*Mk.*) "*and the officers took him with blows-with-the-flat-of-the-hand,*" (*Mt.*) *om.*, but has above "*gave-him-blows-with-the-flat-of-the-hand,*" (*Lk.*) "*and many other things, reviling, they said against him*"

[492] As has been said above, the nearest English equivalent to Mark's word (ράπισμα), as used by Greeks and not by Jews, is "slap." Ράπισμα is condemned by the grammarian Phrynichus as "not in use": and it seems to have been a vernacular word to express a blow given to shew contempt rather than to pain or disable.<sup>2</sup> It is very easy to understand why the later Evangelists altered a word of this kind. A word like "slap" might pass current in a very early Gospel written in the language of the common people; but when the educated became numerous in the Church, some writers or editors of Gospels would naturally correct it.

<sup>1</sup> [491b] Comp. *Mk.* xiv. 47 "But a certain one of (479-80) *the attendants*" with the parall. *Lk.* xxii. 49 "*shall we smite with the sword?*" Here Delitzsch gives, for "*shall we smite,*" הנכינם, i.e. "*shall we smite them?*" This might easily be confused with the Psalmist's word when preceded by the article, "the smiters," הנכים. It is certainly improbable antecedently that a Hebrew Gospel should be so far influenced by a single Biblical phrase as to use a unique word like נכים twice in order to describe the "gathering of the smiters" against the Messiah. But the possibility should be kept before the mind in view of further evidence as to a poetic basis latent beneath the text of *Mk.*

<sup>2</sup> [492a] Lobeck, besides quoting Phrynichus, τὸ ράπισμα οὐκ ἐν χρήσει, adds, from Suidas, ἐπὶ κόρρης, ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς, ἢ γνάθου, ἢ κροτάφου· κόρρη γὰρ ὄλην τὴν κεφαλὴν σὺν τῷ αὐχένι λέγουσι. Τινὲς δὲ καὶ ράπισμα λέγουσι τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γνάθου λαμβάνειν τυπτόμενον καὶ τοῦ κροτάφου, which indicates his doubt about the precise meaning. Suidas apparently does not use λαμβάνειν as *Mk.* does here, but means "to receive a blow on one's cheek." Harpocration says, Ἐπὶ κόρρης τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γνάθου δὲ λέγομεν ἐν τῷ βίῳ (? "in [common] life") ράπισμα. Hesychius says ραπίσαι, ράβδω πλῆξαι, ἢ ἀλοῆσαι, apparently identifying it with ραβδίσαι, which means "thresh" (ἀλοῆσαι) in *Judg.* vi. 11, *Ruth* ii. 17.

[493] But then arises the question, How comes it that this word, altered by Matthew and Luke, is restored, though in a different context, by John, the latest of the Evangelists?

The answer is to be found in the LXX, which uses it *once and once alone*. The passage in which it occurs is Messianic, and the Hebrew, as rendered by R.V., is, "I gave my back to the scourgers and my cheek to *them-that-plucked-off-the-hair*," LXX "blows-with-the-flat-of-the-hand."<sup>1</sup> But the Greek word, besides not being pure Greek, certainly does not express the Hebrew "plucking off the hair." Luke may have avoided it for either or both of these reasons. Similarly, where Nehemiah, according to the Hebrew, says (Neh. xiii. 25), "I smote some (lit. men) of them and I *plucked-off-their-hair*," the LXX has simply "I *smote* men among them."

But it must also be noted that Luke omits mention of the "whipping" or "scourging"—also a prophetic term—inflicted by Pilate. Such an omission could not be justified by the mere consideration that the physical aspect of the Passion was in danger of having too much stress laid upon it. More probably Luke confused the two words "scourge" and "admonish" (or "reprove"), which are almost identical in some forms.<sup>2</sup> But see 502 (v)–(vi).

<sup>1</sup> [493a] Is. l. 6 "to them that plucked off the hair," *eis rāpisma*. A *rāpisma* was a mark of extreme contempt. But that it might be painful, too, is shewn by *Acts of John* (§ 4) "If thy plucking of my beard in jest caused me such pain, what if thou hadst taken me with *blows-with-the-flat-of-the-hand*," where *rāpisma* is almost certainly copied from Mk. and used in the Jewish sense.

The verb *rāpizō*, here employed by Mt., occurs (3) in LXX, Judg. xvi. 25 (B) conflated with *palizō*, Hos. xi. 4 (LXX mistransl.), 1 Esdr. iv. 31 (LXX ins., describing a queen as "slapping" the king's face in playful contempt). Field *Ot. Norvic.* (on Jn. xviii. 22) shews that the use of *rāpizō* to mean "strike with a rod" is (a) ancient or (b) artificially archaic. Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 15. 4) uses it (parallel to 1 K. xxii. 24 *ἐπάταξεν ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα*) *εὐθὺς ραπισθεὶς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ βλαψάτω μου τὴν χεῖρα*.

<sup>2</sup> [493b] Mark xv. 15 (Mt. xxvii. 26) *φραγελλώσας*, (Jn. xix. 1) *ἐμαστίγων*. Luke (xxiii. 22) has merely "having therefore *chastised* (*παίδευσας*) him I will let him go," and Luke does not say that the "chastising" took place. "Chastise"

On the other hand, John uses both the prophetic terms, "scourging," and "blow-with-the-flat-of-the-hand." But he avoids putting the latter word into the mouth of Jesus. The attendant, he says, gave Jesus a *ῥάπισμα* (or "slap"), but Jesus replied "Why dost thou *beat* (*δέρεις*) me?"

"Who" and one form of "why" differ little in Hebrew or Greek: and there would be very little difference between a Greek or Hebrew original "who [is] the striker?" and "why [this] striking?" or "why didst thou strike?" John may possibly have inserted "why dost thou beat me?" as a version of the tradition that the soldiers said "Who strikes thee?"<sup>1</sup>

§ 66. (*Mk.*) "*was*," (*Mt.—Lk.*) "*sat*"

*Mk.* xiv. 66.

*Mt.* xxvi. 69.

*Lk.* xxii. 56.

"And while Peter  
was."

"But Peter *sat*."

"But seeing him  
*sitting*."

It has been suggested (*Clue*, 178–84) that the original was a word that usually meant, "sit"; but that it also meant "remain," "abide," and here probably signified

might be expressed by *נִכַּח*=(1) *παιδεύω*, *Prov.* iii. 12 (*Ακ*), but *LXX* *ἐλέγχω*. There is a possibility of confusion between the 3rd pers. fut. of "scourge" (*נִכַּח*, from *נָכַח*) and *נִכַּח* "admonish." It is possible that Luke used *παιδεύσας* to mean "having admonished him." Comp. above (486), where *Lk.* alone—as a possible conflation of "smiting"—says (xxii. 65), "many other things *in their reviling* (*βλασφημοῦντες*) they said against him." *Βλασφημεῖν* occurs in 2 *K.* xix. 4 as a rendering of *נִכַּח* (*hiph.*): and *Lk.*'s *βλασφημεῖν* may be a conflate of "smiting" (*נִכַּח*) mentioned both by him and by *Mk.—Mt.* in different forms.

<sup>1</sup> [493c] *Jn.* xviii. 23 *τί με δέρεις*; This is the word used here by *Lk.* (xxii. 63) to describe the blows inflicted on Jesus; and it is a word assigned to Jesus by the Synoptists in the Parable of the Vineyard. "Who" = *τις*: "why" (rarely) = *τινα*. "Who (*τις*)," coming before the article (*-η*) in "the [one] striking" (*ὁ παλαιός*) would be easily confused with "why (*τινα*)." But still more easily would *τις* *ο* *παις* *ο* *παις* ("who was the striker?") be confused with *τις* *ο* *παις* *ο* *παις* ("why didst thou strike?"). The letters *c*, *o*, and *e* are frequently interchanged, and, when they come together, one of them is frequently dropped.



"waiting," *i.e.* for the day-light, when it would be lawful to pronounce the sentence.<sup>1</sup>

### § 67. *Peter's three denials*

Mk. xiv. 70.	Mt. xxvi. 72.	Lk. xxii. 58.
"But he again denied."	"And he again denied with an oath, (lit.) that I know not the <i>man</i> ."	"But Peter said, <i>Man</i> , I am not."

[494] The agreement between Matthew and Luke, as against Mark, is very slight—especially as Mark himself has "I know not *this man*," in the third denial—but it raises important questions:—Why do the Evangelists never agree in the words of Peter's three denials and the three preceding charges? <sup>2</sup> Why does John make no mention of "knowing,"

<sup>1</sup> [493*d*] In 180*a* attention was called to Lk. xxii. 55, "having kindled around (*περιψαυρες*)" as having been "never explained." Possibly there is an allusion to a passage where Isaiah describes those who neglect the Light of Israel in order to walk in their own light (Is. l. 11) "Behold all ye that kindle a fire, *that-gird-yourselfes-about* [with] (*מאורי*) firebrands," where the Oxf. Gesen. suggests *אור* for *אור* so as to substitute "kindle" for "gird round." Luke's *περίπτειν* is exactly what one might expect from a conscientious attempt to render literally "gird-round firebrands."

<sup>2</sup> [494*a*] R.V. renders them as follows:—

#### CHARGES.

(i) Mk. xiv. 67.	(i) Mt. xxvi. 69.	(i) Lk. xxii. 56.
"Thou also wast with the Nazarene, [even] Jesus."	"Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean."	"This man also was with him."
(ii) Mk. xiv. 69.	(ii) Mt. xxvi. 71.	(ii) Lk. xxii. 58.
"This is [one] of them."	"This man also was with Jesus the Nazarene."	"Thou also art [one] of them."
(iii) Mk. xiv. 70.	(iii) Mt. xxvi. 73.	(iii) Lk. xxii. 59.
"Of a truth thou art [one] of them; for thou art a Galilaean."	"Of a truth thou also art [one] of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee."	"Of a truth this man also was with him: for he is a Galilaean."



and Matthew and Mark no use of John's simple negative, "I am not"? Why do those who use "not know," disagree as to who, or what, is "not known"? Why do those who use "man," differ as to whether it is vocative or accusative? Also, as regards Peter's questioners, why does Matthew omit the words "Thou art a Galilaean"?

(i) *The original of the first question, perhaps, "Art thou also [one] of the friends of this man?"*

[495] Many of the above-mentioned divergences can be explained by supposing the Hebrew original of the first of the three questions to have been, very nearly as in John, "[Art] thou also [one] of the friends of this man?"<sup>1</sup> John has "disciples" instead of "friends." The former would seem more suitable to many readers of the Gospels, familiar with the term: but the latter would be more natural in the

## DENIALS.

(i) Mk. xiv. 68.

"I neither know, nor understand what thou sayest": (marg. "I neither know nor understand: thou, what sayest thou?")

Mt. xxvi. 70.

"I know not what thou sayest."

Lk. xxii. 57.

"Woman, I know him not."

(ii) Mk. xiv. 70.

"But he again denied it."

Mt. xxvi. 72.

"I know not the man."

Lk. xxii. 58.

"Man, I am not."

(iii) Mk. xiv. 71.

"I know not this man of whom ye speak."

Mt. xxvi. 74.

"I know not the man."

Lk. xxii. 60.

"Man, I know not what thou sayest."

Jn. xviii. 17, 25 has twice "I am not," in answer to the repeated question "Art thou also [one] of this man's (or, his) disciples?" Jn. xviii. 27, in answer to the question "Did not I see thee in the garden with him?", has "Peter therefore denied again."

<sup>1</sup> [495a] Jn. xviii. 17 Μη καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; "Also" would be represented by οὐ. This is very rarely preceded by the interrogative (ἤ), and, when thus preceded, it is sometimes mistranslated (as in Gen. xvi. 13). But even without the interrogative prefix it may, in suitable context, introduce a question, as in Zech. viii. 6 "Also (οὐ) in my eyes should-it-be-marvellous (ἄλλῃ)?" μη καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐμοῦ . . . ;

mouth of the questioner, who would probably regard Jesus not as a teacher but as a ring-leader of turbulent Galilaeans.

Now, in order to express "his men," "his followers," "his friends," "his bands," etc., the LXX often uses the prepositional phrase "those (*οἱ*) with (*μετά*) him": but sometimes, by omitting "those," it represents the Hebrew ambiguously or inaccurately.<sup>1</sup> So, here, we may take as a working hypothesis that there was an original "[one]-of-the-friends-of this man," latent under the Synoptic variations ("along-with (*μετά*) him," "with (*σύν*) him," "[one] of them"). As for the additions, "Jesus," "the Nazarene," "the Galilaeen," they look like attempts to define the original "him," or "this man": and it would seem that Mark conflates the first and second; Matthew, the first and third; while Luke adheres to the original. But, as we shall have to recur hereafter to "the Galilaeen," we may here remark that when Mark and Luke, later on, represent Peter as being called "Galilaeen," Matthew omits the word, and this (Mt. xxvi. 69) is the only place where the term is applied to Jesus.

(ii) "*I know not the man*"

[496] John gives twice as Peter's reply, and Luke once, "I am not," and John is rendered literally in Delitzsch's Hebrew translation, *אֵינִי*. But an Evangelist writing a Gospel in Biblical Hebrew would probably not use this phrase. For in three of the very rare instances in which it

<sup>1</sup> [495<sup>b</sup>] *Oi* (*τά* etc.) *μετά*=Gen. xxiv. 59 "his men," Deut. xi. 6 "that [was] at-their-feet" (*i.e.* "that followed them"), Josh. viii. 5 "the people that are with me" (A inserts "people"), Judg. viii. 5 "the people that are at my feet" (A "the people that are with me," but LXX as Heb.), Amos iv. 2 "your residue" (A.V. "posterity"), Ezek. xxxviii. 22 "his hordes," Dan. ii. 13 (also ii. 18) "his companions" (where Theod. has "friends," but LXX "those with him").

The Oxford Concordance shews where *ὁ* is used before *μετά*, but not (unless there are variations in the Gk.) where *ὁ* is omitted contrary to the Heb. Such omissions occur in Judg. iv. 13 (A), Judg. vii. 1 (LXX om., A ins. *ὁ*), vii. 18 (LXX om., A ins. *οἱ*), vii. 19 (A om.), viii. 4 (A om.) etc.

occurs, it means "I am no more."<sup>1</sup> More probably, therefore, the author of the Hebrew Logia would prefer to repeat the predicate, "I am not *a friend*," or "I am not *a friend of the man*."

Now one Hebrew word to express "a friend" or "familiar companion"—likely to commend itself to the writer of the Logia as being frequently used in the Psalms about the "familiar friends" of the Messiah, and also as being used historically to denote the courtiers of a king—is the passive participle of the verb "know." But the passive participle is easily confused with the active participle (which is indeed once used (Job xix. 13) for "an acquaintance" or "familiar friend"). Hence "I am not a friend [of]" might be interpreted (according as the object "man" was (1) omitted or (2) inserted) (1) "I am not *one-knowing*," or (2) "I am not *one-knowing the man*."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [496a] Delitzsch (for οὐκ εἶμι) gives simply אֲנִי in Jn. xviii. 17 and 25, but לא אֲנִי in Lk. xxii. 58. There is perhaps no passage in the Bible that would give an exact Biblical precedent for the present passage. "I am not (אֲנִי)" occurs only thrice in O.T. without predicate, and then (Ps. xxxix. 13, Job vii. 8, 21) it means "I am no more," or, "I (shall) have vanished," and this is also a frequent meaning in the third person (Gen. xxxvii. 30, 1 K. xx. 40, etc.). On the supposition, therefore, that the Gospels were written (like the Hebrew of Ben Sira) in imitation of Biblical language, it is improbable that Jn.—who omits a predicate after "I am not"—represents the Hebrew original.

<sup>2</sup> [496b] The participle (Pu.) "known" occurs, as a participle, only in Is. xii. 5 "*known* (סִדַּע) [δε, marg. ἵς] this in the whole earth," LXX "make it known (ἀναγγείλατε)." Elsewhere it occurs as a noun="acquaintance," e.g. Ahab's (2 K. x. 11) "familiar friends," also Ps. xxi. 11, lv. 13, lxxxviii. 8, Job xix. 14, Ruth ii. 1 (where Qr. and R.V. סִדֵּעַ "kinsman"). In Is. liii. 3 the pass. participle (lit. "known to" and hence "acquainted with") is rendered "*knowing* how to bear (εἰδὼς φέρειν)." In Job xix. 13 "mine acquaintance (יָדַע)" is rendered "they *knew* (ἐγνώσαν)," and conflated with "my friends (φίλοι μου)." In Job xix. 14, "my familiar-friends (סִדַּעִי) have forgotten me (שָׁכַחוּ)" is rendered "*knowing my name* (leg. שָׁכַח as שָׁכַח) have forgotten me."

The form of the verb סִדַּע (lit. "knowing what?" and hence "what for?" "why?") is very similar to סִדַּע "acquaintance" and may possibly help to account for the marginal reading given by W. H. in Mk. (see 497).



(iii) *Luke's vocatives*

[497] In Peter's first reply, taking (1) "I do not know" as the original, Mark appears to have conflated this with a completed form of it: ( $a_1$ ) "I do not know," and ( $a_2$ ) "I do not know, *i.e.* understand, what thou sayest." But the insertion of the emphatic pronoun "thou," and the order of the words, make it possible that  $a_2$  should be read as two sentences (punctuated as such by W. H. in their margin): ( $a_2$ ) "I do not understand," ( $a_3$ ) "What dost *thou* (emph.) say?" On the other hand, in Peter's third reply, Mark appears to have taken (2) "I do not know the man" as the original, but to have defined the noun by additions, "this man, whom ye speak of."<sup>1</sup>

Matthew has, first, "I do not know what thou sayest," and in the two subsequent denials "I do not know the man."

Luke appears to have found traditions based upon (2) "I do not know *the man* (אִישׁוֹ)," but interpreting "the man" vocatively (since אִישׁ may mean "O" as well as "the"). Hence he, and he alone, has a vocative in each denial. But,

<sup>1</sup> [497a] Ἐπισταμαι, "understand"—the word used by Mk. in "I neither know nor *understand*"—occurs nowhere else in the Gospels. In the LXX (where it almost always=γιν) it is much rarer than οἶδα, not occurring at all in Judg., S., K., 1 Chr., Ezr., and Neh. It is used rather frequently with a negative, as here, to mean emphatically "have not a notion of," "do not in the least understand." It is the kind of word that might be expected in a confused conflation (as in Prov. xiv. 22). In 1 Esdr. viii. 23 it occurs twice parallel to εἰδέναι in Ezr. vii. 25. Codex D has, in Mk. xiv. 68, οὐτε ἠπισσάμην (sic) τι λέγεις: codex d has "neque novi quid dicis," codex a "nec novi quem dicas."

In Mt. xxvi. 70, D has οὐκ οἶδα τι λέγεις οὐδε ἐπισταμαι (codex d is lost), codex a has "nescio quid dicas," codex b, "nescio quid dicis neque intellego." There the position of "quid dicis" shews that it is to be rendered as if it were "quid dicas"; and the same may be the meaning in Mt. as rendered by Corb. and Brix. "nescio quid dicis": but, grammatically, it ought to mean "I know nothing. What sayest thou?"

In Luke, all the Latin MSS. make Peter's third denial, "nescio quid dicis, or, dicas," and D has οὐκ οἶδα τι λέγεις. Also, instead of the second charge (Lk. xxii. 58 "thou also art [one] of them"), D has "the same."

These facts suffice to shew that the details of the Petrine denial were confused at a very early period.



in the first denial, as the person addressed is a woman, he has "O woman (הַאִשָּׁה)," which closely resembles "man."<sup>1</sup> This he seems to have conflated with "him" ("I do not know him, O woman"). His version of the third denial, "that which thou speakest," may be the result of Greek or Hebrew confusion (אִישׁ "man" being conflated as אִשָּׁר "that which," or the Greek "whom" being read as the Greek "that which").<sup>2</sup> But the triple vocative has probably a Hebrew source.

(iv) *Another sign of translation*

[498] Where Mark and Luke have "for thou art a Galilaean," Matthew has "for thy speech bewrayeth thee." Now the Biblical word exactly suited to express the action of self-exposing, or "bewraying"—and the word actually used by Delitzsch to express it here—is גִּלָּה, "make naked," "uncover." But this word may easily be confused with גַּלִּילִי "Galilaean": and the two verbs גִּלָּה and גַּלֵּל are actually confused in two passages of O.T.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [497*b*] The Vocative, with or without prefix, is frequently confused with other cases by the LXX. Sometimes the R.V. itself acknowledges ambiguity, as in 2 S. xxiv. 23 "All this, O (-ה) king, doth Araunah give," marg. "All this did A. the king give," Ps. lii. 4 "O thou . . . tongue," marg. "[and] the tongue"; comp. Ps. cxx. 3 "thou . . . tongue," (LXX) πρὸς γλῶσσαν. For instances of confusion between the vocative and the accusative, see Prov. xxiv. 15 "Lay not wait, O wicked [one]" μὴ προσαγάγῃς ἀσεβῆ, Is. xxvii. 12 "Ye shall be gathered, O sons of Israel," συναγάγετε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ.

The vocative "man" is very rare and the vocative "woman" non-existent, in Biblical Hebrew, so that, if the Gospel was written in that style, Lk. is almost certainly wrong here, as in the Healing of the Paralytic where Lk. alone has (v. 20) "Man," but Mk.-Mt. have "Son" (259). For "man" in Heb., rendered "woman" in Gk., see 1 K. x. 8 "thy men," LXX "thy women."

<sup>2</sup> [497*c*] "Whom," in Gk., i.e. ΟΝ, when written Θ, would easily be confused with Ο, "that which." For an instance of confusion of אִישׁ "man" and the relative, אִשָּׁר, in LXX, comp. Is. xlv. 11 "the man of (אִשָּׁר) my counsel," περὶ ὃν βεβούλευμαι.

<sup>3</sup> [498*a*] Comp. Ps. xxxvii. 5 "Commit (lit. roll) (גַּלֵּל) thy way unto the Lord," where the LXX has "uncover (ἀποκαλύψον) thy way" (leg. גִּלָּה). An opposite confusion is found in 1 S. xiv. 8 "we will discover ourselves," LXX "roll ourselves."

Probably the original was "for thou art a Galilaean"—the speaker assuming that any Galilaean present must be on the side of Jesus. But many readers of the Gospel might be ignorant of the fact that a Galilaean was known to a southern Jew by his dialect, and some might think that the mere fact of being a Galilaean could not be taken, even by a servant of the high priest, to prove complicity with Jesus. Hence might arise a Hebrew substitution of a form of גליל for גלילי, so as to produce "thou hast *bewrayed* thyself," that is, by remarks dropped in conversation with the servants.<sup>1</sup> This seems to have been adopted by Matthew in an amplified form: but it is not certain whether "thy speech" means "thy dialect" or "the substance of what thou sayest." In any case the divergence points to a Hebrew original.<sup>2</sup> There is also some evidence indicating a fair probability that traditions from a Hebrew source may have influenced John's version of the third question (Jn. xviii. 26), "Did not I see thee in the garden?"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [498b] The original may have contained a play on the words "Galilaean" and "bewray": "Thou hast bewrayed thyself, O Galilaean," which Matthew may have taken as the reduplicated verb (which occurs in 1 S. ii. 27, 2 S. vi. 20) "uncovering thou hast uncovered thyself." Indeed it is just possible, but not probable, that such a reduplication (a frequent source of error in the LXX) was the original and that "Galilaean" was an error.

<sup>2</sup> [498c] Whenever Hebrew corruption or obscurity produces divergent traditions, the opportunities of Greek corruption are increased. So here, Mt. may have attempted to combine with his version ("bewrayeth") a modification of Mk.'s "Galilaean" by introducing ΓΑΡΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΟC ("for Galilaean") in the form of a gloss, (Η)ΓΑΡΓΑΛΙΑCΟΥ ("for thy speech"). Comp. Is. xvi. 3, where "bewray" is rendered ἀχθῆς "led into captivity," a rendering that has caused various readings. Two of these, ἀποκαλύψης and ἀποδιώξης, are from the Hebrew: but one, ἀπαρχης, is probably from Greek corruption.

Perhaps, also, some sense that a tradition about "Galilaean" came in *somewhere* in the story of Peter's denials, induced Mt. to insert the word above (Mt. xxvi. 69), unprecedentedly applying it to Jesus.

<sup>3</sup> [498d] The reduplication of the verb meaning "bewray," presupposed as a possible basis for Mt.'s version of the third question to Peter, occurs in 1 S. ii. 27 (lit.) "Have I uncovering uncovered myself?" and in 2 S. vi. 20: and if this tradition, as a rival to that about "the Galilaean," came before Jn., it would be antecedently not improbable that he might prefer some compromise that made

§ 68. (Mk.) (R.V.) "*When he thought thereon,*" (Mt.-Lk.)  
*"having gone out"*

Mk. xiv. 72.

Mt. xxvi. 75.

Lk. xxii. 61, 62.

R.V. "when he thought thereon,"—*i.e.* (lit.) "having-set [-his-mind] on [-it]" —"he wept (so R.V. but Mk. ἔκλαιεν (*i.e.* "began - to - weep"), Mt.-Lk. ἔκλαυσεν).

"And, *having gone out outside, he wept bitterly.*"

"And, having turned, the Lord looked on Peter . . . (62) [*And having gone out outside he wept bitterly.*]"<sup>1</sup>

good sense. Now the word גלה "uncovering" is easily confused with בגנה "in the garden." Indeed the LXX actually substitutes γ "garden" (a shorter form of the word) for β meaning "spring" in Cant. iv. 12. Again, in Sir. xlii. 16 "the sun rising over all things *is revealed* (גלה), the LXX has "over all surveyed, or, looked (ἐπέβλεψεν)." The two errors—in the course of a long period of conflict and blending of various Hebrew traditions—might possibly result in converting "*uncovering* thou hast *uncovered* thyself" into "*in the garden* did I *behold* thee."

[498e] As a minor point, it may be mentioned that the Synoptists all lay stress on the fact that one or more of the servants "see," or "look at," or "gaze earnestly on" Peter. Jn. may have omitted this in his narrative because he regarded the "seeing" as having taken place in the garden and not in the courtyard, and as being mentioned in the dialogue, not in the narrative. For a LXX instance of the transference of "seeing" from narrative to speech comp. 2 S. xiii. 34 "and he looked and behold . . .," where LXX adds, in a conflation, "and he said 'I have seen . . .'"

[498f] Other instances of the interpolation of "garden" are Neh. iii. 16 (lit.) "He repaired . . . as far as (עד) *against* (נגד) the sepulchres of David," LXX "as far as the *garden* (κήπου) of the sepulchre of David," ib. 26 "as far as *against* the gate," LXX "as far as the *garden* of the gate." Mt. xxvii. 61 (Mk.-Lk. differ) says that after Christ's death the women were "sitting *over-against* (ἀπέναντι) the sepulchre." Now "sitting" (9) is a very common LXX error for "returning"; also "over-against" (ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι, etc.) very often represents נגד; and we have seen that in a single passage of Nehemiah נגד, meaning "over-against," is twice mistranslated "garden." Hence it appears that it would be easy to take a Heb. original of Mt. xxvii. 61 as meaning "they returned to the *garden* of the sepulchre." Jn. alone mentions the sepulchre as being in "a garden," and Mary as taking Christ to be the "gardener."

[498g] The context of the passage in Nehemiah above quoted suggests an origin

<sup>1</sup> W. and H. bracket the italicized words in Lk. They are omitted by the best Latin MSS., but SS has them.



[499] No one has satisfactorily explained Mark's extraordinary word "having-set-his-mind-on-it." It has been variously interpreted (1) "having placed [a covering] on [his head]," (2) "thought," or "set his mind," besides other interpretations; but instances are wanting to justify any of them.<sup>1</sup>

[500] "He thought thereon," in Hebrew, would probably be a word used in Job xxxiv. 14 "if he *set* his heart upon him," marg. "if he *cause* his heart *to return* unto himself." This word is frequently used of "setting the mind, or heart,"

for the name Mt. xv. 39 "Magadan" (C "Magdalan," L "Magdala," SS "Magdan"), (parall. to Mk. viii. 10 "Dalmanutha," B "Dalmanuntha," D "Melegada," with other variations, "Magaïda," "Magdala," "Magdal," etc.).

Neh. iii. 19 "*over against* (מגדל) the going up" is rendered by LXX "*tower of ascent*," reading "Migdal" מגדל, which is rendered "Magada" by LXX in Josh. xv. 37 (Luc. "Magdal"). The passage in Mt. describes a crossing of the Lake of Gennesaret, and the original was probably "he came to the *opposite* coast," lit. "he came to the coast *opposite* (מגדל), or, opposite him (מגדל)." Mt. has transliterated the adverb as the name of a place, except that he has transposed *n*, making "Magadan" instead of "Mangad." But the word might naturally be confused by some with "Migdal" ("tower"), which is frequently a part of the name of a place: and the Codices C and L may have introduced *l* owing to some confusion with the reading "Migdal" ("tower"), perceptible also in the parall. Mk. where the *l* appears in "Dalmanutha" and variants.

[498½] As regards Mk.'s "Dalmanutha," if the Hebrew "Mangad" was treated as the name of a town, it would be natural to place "to," i.e. "el (אל)," before it. But "el," or "l—"as in 2 S. xxiv. 5 ("unto (אל) Jazer," "Eliezer"), 1 Chr. xxiv. 12 ("to (ל) Jakim," A "Eliakeim")—might be treated as part of the name by a Greek translator. Now in 1 Chr. xi. 47 "Eliel (אליאל)" becomes (perhaps by Greek corruption) "Daleiel"; Numb. iii. 24 "Lael (לאל)" becomes "Dael"; Judg. i. 31 "Ahlab (אחלב)" becomes "Dalaph"; Ezr. viii. 17 "Iddo (אידו)" becomes in 1 Esdr. viii. 44, 45 (A) "Doldaios" (LXX Laadaïos or Lodaïos). These instances of the introduction of the Greek Δ in the transliteration of syllables containing α, and the influence of confused readings of "Migdal" ("tower") or the pl. "Migdalouth" might explain the rise of "Dalmanutha" from an original "Mangad" without further glosses. At the same time it is quite possible that, in the desperate state of Mk.'s text, Aramaic glosses (such as the emphatic form of the Talmudic word for "harbour" (Herz, Black, *Enc.* "Dalmanutha," דרליסניחא) or a transliteration of the preceding word "parts" (i.e. "the parts of Magdala," μέρη) (Nestle, *ib.* סנחא) may have contributed to the formation of the name.

<sup>1</sup> Ἐπιβαλὼν, *without an object*, is used to mean "continuing (a discourse)," but not in sense (1) or (2); Field and other able scholars support (1), but without alleging an instance of the verb used thus without an object.



and, on one occasion, without an object (Job iv. 20) "without any regarding it," lit. "without *one-setting* [*his mind-on it*]." <sup>1</sup> In the first of these two passages (xxxiv. 14) the Hebrew itself (text and margin) varies between "set" and "(cause to) return." <sup>2</sup> So here, "He [the Lord] *caused him* [Peter] *to return*" might be confused with "he [Peter] *set* [*his mind on it*]," i.e. on his fault (or "on Him," i.e. his Master). On the other hand, the word might be interpreted "he [i.e. Peter] returned," in a literal sense, i.e. went away from the courtyard, which might give rise to the Matthew-Luke tradition, "went out outside."

[501] Luke, in the tradition peculiar to his Gospel, has probably preserved the original of Mark's obscure term, viz. that "the Lord *caused Peter to return*," or "converted" Peter; which might easily be interpreted as "*turned and looked towards Peter*."<sup>3</sup> Luke adopts the latter interpretation.

### [502] § 69. *The Jews prefer Barabbas to Jesus*

Mk. xv. 9, 11, 12. Mt. xxvii. 17, 20—22. Lk. xxiii. 16, 18, 20.

<p>"Will ye [that] I release for you the King of the Jews? . . . (11) But the chief priests stirred up the</p>	<p>"Whom will ye [that] I release for you, Barabbas or Jesus that is called Christ? . . . (20) But</p>	<p>"Having chastised (or, admonished) him therefore I will release [him]"<sup>4</sup> . . . (18) But they cried-aloud with-</p>
--	--	---

<sup>1</sup> In both cases the LXX is confused. Job xxxiv. 14 *εἰ γὰρ βούλοιο συνέχειν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα παρ' αὐτοῦ κατασχεῖν*, Job iv. 20 *παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς αὐτοῖς βοηθῆσαι*. Comp. Dan. vi. 14 (Aram.) "he *set his heart* (בָּלַם) on Daniel to deliver him," Theod. *ἡγωνίσαστο περὶ τοῦ Δ., LXX ἐβοήθει*.

<sup>2</sup> "Set (סִם)," "return (שׁוּב)." Hebrew confusion between "m" and "b" is very frequent (516a).

<sup>3</sup> [501a] Comp. Judg. vi. 14 (נָבַח) "looked upon," marg. "turned towards," καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν (A ἐπέβλεψεν) πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἄγγελος. The word ἐπιστρέφειν is used of Peter spiritually in Lk. xxii. 32 *σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς σου*. There is also much to be said for giving the word a spiritual signification in Jn. xxi. 20 *ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ Πέτρος* (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 25).

<sup>4</sup> Lk. xxiii. 16 is rep. in Lk. xxiii. 22 (b) "having chastised him therefore I will release (him)."

multitude in order that rather he should release for them Barabbas. (12) . . . What<sup>1</sup> therefore shall I do [to him] whom ye call the King of the Jews ? ”

the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes in order that they should ask for Barabbas, but destroy Jesus. (21) . . . Whom will ye of the two [that] I release for you ? But they said Barabbas. (22) . . . What therefore shall I do to Jesus who is called Christ ? ”

all - their - multitude saying, Away with this man, but release for us Barabbas . . . (20) But again Pilate called-to [them] willing to release Jesus.”

With these must be compared Jn. xviii. 39-40 “ Desire ye therefore [that] I release for you the King of the Jews ? (40) They therefore shouted again saying, Not this [man], but Barabbas.”

(a) *The difficulties of the passage*

[502 (i)] The positive agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark consists of little more than the substitution of an antithesis between Jesus (or “ this man ”) and Barabbas in place of Mark’s “ rather ”: and this agreement is not verbally exact. But there is also a negative agreement in their omission of all mention of a “ king ” in Pilate’s question to the multitude. Why did Matthew and Luke omit this ? Is it an interpolation in Mark, favoured by John but not known to Matthew and Luke ? Or did they omit it because they considered it unseemly jesting, and did John insert it because he regarded Pilate’s jesting as subordinated to the divine purpose of testifying to Christ’s sovereignty ?

Again, why does Matthew alone represent Pilate as asking which “ of the two ” he is to release, whereas in Mark

<sup>1</sup> Codex D and SS insert “ will ye (*θέλετε*), ” supporting Tischendorf.

and John the question is, shall he release their "king," and in Luke, no question at all, but simply "I will release"? Matthew's version implies that one of the two *must* be released: and Matthew and John refer to a "customary" release:<sup>1</sup> but no trace of such a custom has been alleged, and Luke makes no mention of it. The most reasonable supposition is that no such custom ever existed; but if it had no existence, whence did the mention of it find its way into two at least of the four Gospels? And why does Luke (besides being silent about the "custom") omit the questions of Pilate ("Will ye . . .?" "Whom will ye . . .?" "What therefore shall I do . . .?" etc.)? Lastly, why does Luke twice insert, in connection with the "release," a mention of "chastising" (or "admonition")?

(β) "*Will ye?*" "*What therefore?*" or "*What (or, Whom) will ye?*"

[502 (ii)] In the only instance where the phrase "what wilt thou? (τί θέλεις;)" occurs in LXX, the literal Hebrew is "What [is] *to thee*, or, *for thee* (לְךָ)?"<sup>2</sup> If, therefore, Pilate said to the multitude, "What will ye? Shall I release . . .?" the Biblical Hebrew for this would be "What *for you* shall I release?" This would suggest to a Greek a broken

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxvii. 15 "the governor was accustomed," Jn. xviii. 39 "it is a custom among you that I release." Mk. xv. 6, 8 κατὰ δὲ [D ins. τὴν, Diatess. "at every feast"] ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν . . . καθὼς ἐποίει, might mean, even in the Greek, and still more easily in a Hebrew original, that Pilate was *on the point of* releasing, or *intending* to release, during the feast, a certain prisoner for whom the people had petitioned, and that the Jews now asked him to do as he was *intending* to do. But ἐποίει, thus used, would be rather harsh.

<sup>2</sup> [502 (ii) a] The single instance is Esth. v. 3 (R.V.) "What wilt thou?" lit. "What to thee (לְךָ נָּ)?" τί θέλεις; Elsewhere, the Hebrew being the same, R.V. varies, "what wouldst thou?" "what aileth thee?" "what meanest thou?" LXX renders it τί ἐστίν σοι; "what is to thee?" in Josh. xv. 18, Jud. i. 14, 2 S. xiv. 5, 1 K. i. 16, etc. Jon. i. 6 (R.V.) "What meanest thou (lit. What to thee?), O sleeper?" is rendered τί σὺ βέγχεις; "Why dost thou slumber?" So at least it is punctuated by Swete. But? τί σὺ; βέγχεις; "What meanest thou? dost thou slumber?"



sentence, "What for you? Shall I release?" And it might originate—or favour the adoption of—various paraphrases, marginal alternatives, and corrupt renderings, *e.g.* "What shall I do for you? Shall I release?" or "What do you want? Shall I release?" "What then τί οὖν) (lit. What therefore?)? Shall I release?" or "Do you want me to release?"

Again, in Greek, "*What* for you shall I release?" might easily be taken for "*Whom* for you shall I release?" τι, "what," being supposed to be an error for τῖ representing an elided ΤΙΝ(Δ).<sup>1</sup> This might give rise to amplifications "*Whom* shall I release, this person or that?" or "*Which of the two* shall I release?"

Again, we have found above (432) that "for (*or, to*) you" and "for (*or, to*) them" are interchanged with "therefore" in LXX and probably in the Synoptists. Hence, if translation has been at work here, we may expect to find "for you" conflated with, or parallel to, "therefore"; and this, as a fact, is found to be the case in Mark's and Matthew's versions of Pilate's second question, Matthew apparently conflating "Whom of the two shall I release for you?" with "What therefore shall I do?" so as to make two questions, a second and a third, out of Mark's second. "Therefore" also occurs in Luke's parallel, "I will *therefore* release him."

(γ) "*Your king*"

[502 (iii)] But, further, "what will ye?"—especially if written (as in Is. iii. 15) מלכם—differs little from "your

<sup>1</sup> [502 (ii) δ] In Heb., the "what (מַה)" might easily be confused with the nom. מִי "who," but not so easily with the accus. which is preceded by מִי. However, on one occasion "what (מַה) didst thou see?" is rendered by the LXX "whom (τίνα)" (1 S. xxviii. 13). Τίνα in N.T. occurs perhaps only once before a vowel (Jn. vi. 68 πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα;). Elision is rare in N.T. MSS., but, under the circumstances, might easily be supposed by scribes to exist. Or, if τι was immediately followed by ἀπολυσω, it would be easy to suppose that τῖα was an error for τῖαα.



king (מלכּם)," a phrase used in John ("shall I crucify *your king* ?"). If, therefore, the original was,<sup>1</sup> "What will ye? Shall I release *your king*?" it was very natural that "your king" should be cancelled, or corrected, by some authorities, as being a corrupt repetition of "what will ye?" The belief that it was erroneous might be favoured perhaps by the rarity of this particular form of the word "king" in the Bible, and certainly by the antecedent improbability that an ordinary Roman governor would thus jest with a Jewish multitude about their "king."<sup>1</sup>

Another way of meeting the difficulty would be to suppose that "your king," when used by Pilate to a large crowd of pilgrims including many Galileans, might be an inaccurate but complimentary way of denoting Herod Antipas—who was only a tetrarch, but wished to be a king, and is habitually called a king by Mark—and that Pilate spoke, not about "remitting Jesus, their king," but about "remitting Jesus *to* their king [*i.e.* for trial]" (56). This view appears to have been taken by Luke (56, 503 (iii)).

(δ) *The origin of the tradition about the "custom"*

[502 (iv)] Mark rather favours the view that Barabbas had *not* been convicted of crime. He had been "imprisoned," he says, "*along with* (μετά) the rebels (τῶν στασιαστῶν) *who in the rebellion had committed murder.*" This might easily be taken to mean, as Luke says, that he had been "cast into prison *on account of* rebellion and murder"; but Mark's words appear to state the charge as one of complicity, or companionship, and not overt action. If this is the meaning, Pilate, in proposing to release Barabbas on the feast-day, was merely reserving the release of a prisoner, arrested under suspicion, for a time when it was particularly desirable to put

<sup>1</sup> In 1 K. ix. 26 "the king" is parall. to 2 Chr. viii. 17 הלך "went," and in Sir. xlviii. 12 כּל "before any" = ὑπὸ ἀρχοντος (leg. ἄρχ).

the populace in good humour. The notion that this was a custom (a view taken by John as well as Matthew) might spring from several causes. The verb "to be in the habit of [doing]" used by Matthew might possibly (but not probably) be represented in Biblical Hebrew by a word that in the non-causative mood means "cherish," "profit," "serve." Moreover, in Greek, the imperfect might mean "he was intending to do" or "in the habit of doing." And in Biblical Greek, as well as in Hebrew, "one" may mean either "*one* [and no more]" or "a *certain* [prisoner then under arrest, namely, Barabbas]." Hence, "he was intending to *humour* the people by liberating a [*certain*] prisoner during the feast" might be interpreted as meaning "he was *in the habit of* liberating for the people *one* prisoner during the feast." This interpretation would be confirmed by the mistranslation above mentioned, "*Which [of them] shall I release?*" which might be taken to imply that one of the two *must* be released; and this involved a "custom." When the belief in the "custom" was established, some Evangelists might naturally insert an explicit statement about it for clearness.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [502 (iv) a] Concerning the "custom" see Swete on Mk. xv. 6 "there seems to be no other evidence than that which the Gospels furnish," and similarly Westc. on Jn. xviii. 39. There is no justification (Black, *Ency.*, BARABBAS) for the hypothesis of such a custom in Livy's (v. 13. 8) account of the first celebration of the Roman Lectisternia, or in Dion. Halicar. xii. 9 (= 10).

[502 (iv) b] The Heb. נָסַח (Gesen. Oxf.) means "be of use, or service," "benefit." In I K. i. 2, 5 it = "cherish," but in Numb. xxii. 30 the hiph. means "I am in the habit." It is most frequ. in Job, where it is transl. *ḥēl* in Job xv. 3 "profit." In Phoenician it means (Gesen. Oxf.) "prefect," and it is similar to the Biblical נָסַח "governor," with which it might be confused. It is more probable, however, that the easy word "governor" should be substituted for the difficult "benefit" than *vice-versa*.

But the word נָסַח in New Heb. means mostly "endanger," and is not likely to have been used by an Evangelist in the sense of "humour." More probably, therefore, the erroneous notion of a "custom" originated from a misinterpretation of a participial or imperfect form.

(ε) (*Lk.*) "*having chastised (or, admonished) him*"

[502 (v)] The Greek word here rendered "chastise" means, in classical Greek and in the Acts of the Apostles, "educate" or "train." It occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 6) (R.V.) "whom the Lord loveth he *chasteneth*" (lit. "*traineth*," παιδεύει). There the writer is quoting from Proverbs iii. 12 (R.V.) "Whom the Lord loveth he *reproveth*" (ינח from ירח), and is deviating from the LXX, which has "whom the Lord loveth he *reproveth* (ἐλέγχει)," but two of the best MSS. have "*traineth* (παιδεύει)." Having regard to the almost invariably mild sense in which παιδεύω is used in N.T., it is possible that Luke may mean "I will release him *with a reproof*, or, *reprimand*." But he may mean "after *punishment*." Later on, where Mark and Matthew say "Pilate delivered over Jesus *having-flogged-him* (φραγελλώσας, not μαστιγώσας, "scourged") *that he might be crucified*," Luke has "delivered over Jesus *to their will*." Yet John, too, mentions a "scourging (ἐμαστίγωσεν)" of Jesus: only he places it before the sentence of death.<sup>1</sup> The question arises, why does Luke alone twice insert a mention of "chastisement" or "reproof," and alone omit all mention of "flogging" or "scourging"?

(ζ) *Luke's insertions and omissions*

[502 (vi)] If Luke's insertions and omissions proceeded simply from a desire to minimise Pilate's severity, his credit as a historian would suffer. But there is some ground for supposing that he found a basis for his view in the original Hebrew. The Hebrew ינח, translated "reprove" in the above-quoted passage from Proverbs, is fairly similar, in some forms, to the Hebrew "king": and Luke's "having

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xv. 15, Mt. xxvii. 26, Lk. xxiii. 25, Jn. xix. 1.



chastised" is parallel to, and may be a substitute for, Mark's "king."<sup>1</sup> But a more probable explanation is that Luke found a Hebrew tradition inserting the word "governor"—freely used by Matthew, but not by Luke, in the account of the Passion—"And *the governor* said, I will release him." This, in Hebrew order, would be "and said *the governor*." Now one word for "governor" (written סר, instead of שר) is easily confused with the regular Hebrew for "chastise" (יסר). The result of such a confusion might be "And he said, 'Having-chastised . . .'"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "King" = סלך; "reprove" = יכח, particip. מוכיח; "scourging" = פכה.

<sup>2</sup> [502 (vi) a] Gesen. Oxf. on Jer. vi. 28 says that שרי = שרי = "princes." In New Heb. שר is the regular word for "prince." And comp. 1 S. xxii. 14 (R.V.) "taken into (אל), (שר אל)," but LXX ἀρχων (leg. שר), and see *Internat. Crit. Comm.* (II. P. Smith) ad loc., "שר is only another spelling for שר as is indicated by ἀρχων, LXX." In Hos. vii. 14 "they rebelled (יסרו)" is rendered "they were chastised" ἐπαυδούθησαν (leg. as from יסר).

[502 (vi) δ] A third alternative is presented by Lev. xix. 20 "scourging (בקר)," lit. "investigation," but traditionally rendered "punishment" (Gesen. Oxf. "punishment after examination (investigation))." The Heb. LXX renders it ἐπισκοπή "visitation," reading פקר for פקר. But פקר means "chief officer," "magistrate" or "general," and might represent "governor" here.

[502 (vi) ε] But perhaps the most probable explanation of all would start from the fact that the painstaking historian Lk. makes Pilate say "Having chastised, I will release"; that this is, in effect, "I will release and I will [merely] chastise"; that "I will chastise," in Biblical Hebrew, is almost necessarily איסר; and that there is very little difference (merely the transposition of a *yod*) between "I will chastise," איסר, and "prisoner," אסיר. Let us therefore assume, hypothetically, that Pilate's first question to the multitude was: "What [is to be done] for you? Shall I release the *prisoner* (אסיר) for you?"

(1) Mk., being under the impression (502 (iii) and (ii)) that "What for you?" meant "your king," may have read שר, "prince," for שר, dropping א—a letter frequently dropped by scribes—and thereby producing the sentence, "Your king shall I release, the prince for you?" i.e. "the king your prince." This he paraphrased as "the king of the Jews." Similarly, in 1 Chr. xv. 22, "instructed (יכר)"—the word regularly rendered "chastise"—appears to be rendered by the LXX ἀρχων, "ruler" (leg. שר).

(2) Other interpreters, accepting the true reading "prisoner," were divided among themselves as to who was meant. Barabbas (Mk. xv. 7, Mt. xxvii. 16) had just been described as "prisoner." Hence "Barabbas" might naturally be substituted for "prisoner" in the text by some. But others understood Pilate to mean Jesus. Hence "Jesus" would be inserted in the margin. Thence would spring many confections: (1) "Jesus Barabbas," a reading supported by several



As regards Luke's apparent substitution of "their will" for "having flogged . . . that he might be crucified," it must be remembered that, according to Roman custom, "flogging" preceded crucifixion. Luke, aware that all his readers knew what those condemned to crucifixion had to expect, and feeling that enough had been said about it by the earlier Evangelists, implies the flogging in the words "delivered him over" to the "will" of those who had cried "crucify him."

[502 (vii)] But there is some possibility, here too, of mistranslation. Delitzsch gives, as the Hebrew for "to *their will*," רצונם, from רצון, "good will," "satisfaction." But he gives the same word in Mark (xv. 15), "wishing to do *what-was-satisfying* to the people." Now the root of this word is רצה, "seek the good will of," said by some (see Buhl) to be confused with רצע, "crush," "oppress," in Job xx. 10 (R.V. txt.) "*seek the favour of*," (marg.) "*oppress*." But it is more easily confused with רצה, "break," "crush," "pierce," "stab," "murder." The noun form of the latter is used in Ps. xlii. 10 (lit.) "[As] with a *crushing* (רצה) in my bones mine adversaries reproach me," and the participle (Pi.) means "murderers." It is possible that in some tradition declaring that Pilate delivered Jesus up *to the murderers* Luke may have rendered the italicized words

extant authorities (see W. H. vol. ii. on Mt. xxvii. 16). Others would add, "who is called," meaning "the Jesus *who is called* Barabbas." But "who is called" might be applied to the Lord Jesus, and then it would demand the addition of "Christ"—"Jesus who is called Christ." Out of all these confusions there might spring "Barabbas or Jesus who is called Christ"—the tradition adopted by Mt.

(3) A third class, while adhering most faithfully to the letters of the Hebrew Original, would seem to have departed furthest from its meaning. The Hebrew "bind," or "imprison" (אסר), is, even in ordinary circumstances, easily confused with the Hebrew "chastise" (אסר); and the confusion actually takes place in two passages of the LXX (Ps. cv. 22, Hos. x. 10). But the insertion of ׀ (the sign of the 1st pers. sing. fut.) in the form here used by Lk. makes it particularly easy to mistake אסר, "prisoner," for אסר, "I will chastise." This error Lk. appears to have committed.

"to their will." Others may have conflated them as ( $a_1$ ) "to satisfy them" ( $a_2$ ) "to murder." The latter ( $a_2$ ), when expressed in detail, would be "to flog and crucify": and there is no great difference between this and "delivered over . . . having flogged, to be crucified." Mark may have adopted this conflation. Or, if "to their will" was the original, Mark's conflation may have resulted from an attempt to correct a vague and inaccurate translation ("to satisfy") by adding to it a definite paraphrase.

(η) *Traces of disconnection in Mk.'s account*

[503 (i)] Mark (xv. 2) gives, as Pilate's first words to Jesus, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" But this comes very abruptly from a judge who, as far as Mark's narrative goes, has never been informed that the prisoner had called himself king. Mark himself later on implies that this accusation had been brought; for he makes Pilate say "What then shall I do to him *whom ye call* the king of the Jews?" But no such "calling," in Pilate's presence, has been anywhere mentioned by Mark (or by Matthew).

Luke supplies the defect by saying that, when the chief priests brought Jesus to Pilate, they accused Him thus: "We have found this man perverting (διαστρέφοντα) our nation . . . and *saying that he himself is Messiah, king.*" This makes everything clear. But if it was so clear in the original, why did Mark omit what made it clear? And why does John make no mention of it when he, at the same point as Luke, introduces the chief priests as making no charge except, indirectly, the vague one of "doing evil"?<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [503 (i) a] Jn. xviii. 30 "If this man were not *an evil-doer* (κακὸν ποιῶν) we should not have brought him to thee." "Evil-doing" may be, as in Deut. xix. 16, "rebellion (סרה)": and it is quite possible that Jn.'s "evil-doer" condenses some Hebrew original (amplified in Lk. xxiii. 2, 5) implying a charge of treason and of *claiming to be king*. This would explain Jn. xviii. 33 "Art thou *the king of the Jews?*"

Here it must be added that Luke, in a second version of the charges brought by the chief priests, says, "He stirreth up (*ἀνασείει*) the people." Now the Greek "stir up" occurs in the whole of the Bible only here and in Mark's context "stirred up the multitude [against Jesus]." Thus, Mark applies it to what the chief priests *did* concerning Jesus, while Luke applies it to what the chief priests *said* concerning the doings of Jesus. Surely this is almost irresistible evidence that Mark and Luke are giving different applications of the same original.

Again, Delitzsch gives as the Hebrew of Luke's "pervert" (in "*perverting* our nation") *the same word as that by which he renders Mark's "stir up"* (in "*stirred up* the multitude"); and this suggests that Luke's two versions are simply two Greek translations or paraphrases of one Hebrew original, misplaced and misapplied, as well as obscured, in Mark.

(θ) *Luke may have rearranged and amplified Mark*

[503 (ii)] One very frequent cause of error in the LXX is the Hebrew practice of inserting, out of chronological order, appended or parenthetical remarks (241*a*), which are taken by the LXX as statements that so and so happened *in the ordinary sequence*.

Now, after the words "will ye that I release for you the king of the Jews," Mark has (xv. 10-11) "For he understood-all-the-while (*ἐγίνωσκειν*) that for envy there had delivered him over (or, reported, or, informed against him) (*παράδεδώκεισαν*) [the chief priests], but *the chief priests* stirred up the multitude." "The chief priests" appears to be corruptly repeated, and is bracketed in the first instance by W. H. Having regard to this, and to the frequent confusion of singular and plural in LXX, and the frequent omission in Hebrew of a verb of speech (459 (i)), it is quite possible that the Original meant "He understood-all-the-



while that for envy there had delivered him over the chief priests [*saying*, 'He'] stirred up the multitude [to make him king ']."

If so, it was natural for an orderly historian like Luke to place this charge of "stirring up the multitude" at the time when it was uttered, that is, when Jesus was first brought before Pilate. But he may have found some difficulty in deciding whether the "stirring up," or (503 (i) a) "rebellion," was against Rome or against Moses. At all events he mentions two charges, first, a political one (Lk. xxiii. 2 "perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar . . ."), and then a charge against Jesus as a "teacher" (Lk. xxiii. 5 "He stirreth up the people, teaching . . ."). These have the appearance of a conflation.<sup>1</sup>

(i) *Luke's mention of "no fault," and his two-fold mention of Herod*

[503 (iii)] It has been pointed out (56) that Luke may have interpreted a tradition, "Pilate said that he would release (*lit.* send) Jesus, the king of the Jews," as meaning "Pilate said that he would send Jesus *to* the king of the Jews"—an inaccurate way of saying "to Herod." Now the Greek "release" may mean "acquit"; and this indeed is

<sup>1</sup> [503 (ii) a] As bearing upon the various applications of "stirring up the people," it may be worth mentioning that the three forms of the *Acta Pilati* all concur (§ 9) in assigning to Pilate—beside the question "What then am I to do with Jesus [A and Lat. add "who is called Christ]?"—another question, not addressed to the multitude but to the few honest Jews who take the side of Jesus (A and Lat.), "What shall I do, because there is *insurrection* (*στάσις*) among the people," (B) "What do you say that I should do because the people *is-in-commotion* (*ταράσσεται*)?" "Because" in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, is easily confused with "who." Hence these words might easily represent an original, "What shall I do to him who is [as you say] *stirring up* (*מַחֲמִיד*) the people?" Is it possible that the *o* in this word may be a corruption of *e*, and *n* of *n*, so that the original was מָשַׁח, "anointed, or, Christ"? If so, this saying of the *Acta* may be a version of Matthew's "What therefore shall I do to Jesus who *is called Christ*?" (parall. Mk. "to him whom *ye call king of the Jews*"). Comp. Levy, מָשַׁח.



its regular meaning in connection with a legal trial. It was very natural, then, that later Evangelists should give the word this meaning, as it was more favourable both to Jesus and to Pilate that the latter should be represented as wishing, not to "let off," but to "acquit," the prisoner. But, if so, the verb could not be used interrogatively. Pilate might say "Shall I *release*, or *let off*?" but no judge, even the most corrupt, could say to a crowd "Shall I *acquit* the accused?" Luke and John appear to conflate ( $a_1$ ) "I will release" (Jn. "Do ye desire that I release") with ( $a_2$ ) "I acquit," in different paraphrases, "I find no fault, nothing faulty, nothing worthy of death, etc." But Luke seems also to have adopted a version of "releasing the king of the Jews," which not only converted the object of the verb to the subject but also "release" to "acquit" ("the king of the Jews acquits him"); and this would justify him (on the supposition that Herod was intended by this inaccurate designation) in writing, as a paraphrase, that Pilate said (Lk. xxiii. 14-15), "I found no fault in this man . . . *no, nor yet [did] Herod.*"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [503 (iii) a] But how are we to explain Lk. xxiii. 12 "And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day: for before, they were at enmity between themselves"? Is this to be regarded as Lk.'s editorial and inferential addition, based perhaps on some historical fact of an estrangement and a reconciliation between Pilate and Herod, but having no real historical connection with the trial of Christ and no basis in the Original tradition?

Possibly, it had some basis in the Hebrew. The words in question come at the end of the section (peculiar to Luke) describing the examination by Herod (Lk. xxiii. 6-12). Now at the end of Luke's next section, describing Pilate's final examination, come the words commented on above (502 (vii)) (Luke xxiii. 25) "to their will," which appear to have been differently interpreted by Mark as "desiring to satisfy." Now if Luke was possessed with the notion that Herod played a leading part in this history, he may have accepted a marginal explanation, or oral tradition, stating that the person "satisfied" was the Tetrarch. And it happens that the verb in question  $\text{נִחַם}$ , there supposed to be a latent cause of the Synoptic variations, means, in 1 S. xxix. 4, "reconcile oneself to." Taking this view that the Gospel contained the words "So Pilate reconciled himself," and that the person to whom he reconciled himself was Herod, Luke might feel justified in adding editorially "for, before, they were at enmity among themselves."

(κ) "*Not this man but Barabbas*"

[503 (iv)] Mark's version of the reply of the multitude, to Pilate's question "Shall I release your king?" is conveyed in indirect speech thus, "The chief priests stirred up the multitude in order that *rather* (μᾶλλον) *he should release Barabbas.*" Now "rather," when it occurs in those parts of the LXX which are translated from Hebrew, always means "in a greater degree," e.g. "Jacob loved Rachel *rather* than Leah."<sup>1</sup>

Mark's version is therefore stamped as being no literal translation from Hebrew, because it uses the word "rather" in the Greek sense meaning "instead of." But Delitzsch gives the Hebrew of Mark as (lit.) "*not-to* (לֹבֵלֵת) *release but* (כִּי אִם) *Barabbas.*" These words Luke and John separate from the "stirring up," and take as the direct utterance of the people. And these Evangelists simplify the awkward sentence by omitting or transposing "release," and introducing an antithesis: "Not this man (or, Away with this man), but Barabbas (or, release Barabbas)." Matthew follows Mark, but feels that "stirred up the multitude that" requires the sentence to proceed, "that *the multitude*"—not Pilate—"should do something." So he writes "that they should ask." He also substitutes for "stirred up" the more familiar "persuaded." The result is "persuaded the multitudes that *they should ask for Barabbas.*" Then the negative particle ("not to"), paraphrased by Luke as "away with," is rendered by Matthew "destroy"—"and destroy Jesus."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [503 (iv) a] Gen. xxix. 30. Μᾶλλον, when it occurs in LXX in the Greek sense, is in non-Hebrew books, or in LXX insertions or paraphrases, e.g. Job xxx. 26 "when I looked for good *then came evil*," LXX paraphrases, "Behold there befell me *rather* days of evils": Prov. xviii. 2 "he hath no delight in . . . *but only* (כִּי אִם) *that his heart may reveal itself*," LXX "for *rather* is he led captive by folly."

<sup>2</sup> The form לֹבֵלֵת is frequently used with nouns, e.g. "no water," "no help," and might conceivably be used, by one attempting to write in Biblical Hebrew, to

§ 69 (a). *Possibilities of Greek corruption in the context*

[504] It has been suggested above (502 (ii)) that "what" and "whom" may have been interchanged owing to confusion between the Greek  $\tau\iota$  and  $\tau\acute{\iota}$ . Possibly also Greek corruption had something to do with Matthew's choice of the particular word used by him to mean "destroy" ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$ ), which closely resembles "release" ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta$ ). The two words are confused in at least one passage of the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

Again, Matthew's "persuaded" ( $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu$ ) may be, not a mere arbitrary correction of a rare word, but based on a various reading of Mark's "stirred up" ( $\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu$ , perhaps written  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu$ ).

Moreover, Origen recognizes the existence of a reading in Matthew (xxvii. 17) "Jesus Barabbas," and this is found in the Sinaitic Syrian. Now the word "Jesus," in the accusative, is generally represented by the abbreviation  $\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}$ . Also, in this particular passage, it would immediately follow another  $\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}$ .<sup>2</sup> Whether "Jesus" was in the Hebrew original, or in a marginal Hebrew addition (502 (vi) c (2)), or in neither, Greek corruption may well have been at work in the insertion or in the omission, in extant MSS.

Lastly, the Greek "What then?" often stands by itself, meaning "What is to be said, or done?" "What next?" Codex Bezae and SS insert "will ye ( $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ )," so as to make the meaning clear. But, with this insertion, the Greek

mean "None of this man!" But no instance of it with imperative force seems to occur in O.T.

<sup>1</sup> Job ix. 22 "He destroyeth,"  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$  (A  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$ ). A very natural first correction of Mk. would be (lit.) "that rather Barabbas *than* ( $\eta$ ) *Jesus* he should release ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta$ )." Then, when Mt. corrected "rather" into "they should ask," it would be a slight alteration to drop  $\eta$ , and to substitute  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\eta$  (in the pl.) for  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\eta$ : "that they should ask Barabbas, destroy Jesus."

<sup>2</sup> [504a] Mt. xxvii. 17 ". . . *to-you Jesus*" would be  $\gamma\bar{\iota}\bar{\mu}\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}\bar{\iota}\bar{\nu}$ . The two last letters might be inserted by corrupt repetition, or, if genuine, might be rejected as a corrupt repetition (W. H. vol. ii. on Mt. xxvii. 16).



letters of "will ye that I do?" might closely resemble those of "will ye that I release?" Matthew conflates the two."<sup>1</sup>

§ 70. (Mk.) "*bring*," (Mt.-Lk.) "*come*"

Mk. xv. 22.	Mt. xxvii. 33.	Lk. xxiii. 33.
"And they bring (lit. carry) him to . . ."	"and having <i>come</i> to . . ."	"and when they <i>came</i> to . . ."

[505] It has been shewn (449) that Matthew and Luke prefer the word "lead" to Mark's "carry," when applied to persons, animals, etc. They also avoid the historic present, and substitute here the past.<sup>2</sup> But, besides this, they probably interpreted non-causatively the Hebrew "come" which Mark interpreted causatively. This error is very frequent in the Septuagint.<sup>3</sup>

§ 71. (Mt.) "*watched him* ((Lk.) *crucified him*) *there*"

Mk. xv. 24, 25.	Mt. xxvii. 35, 36.	Lk. xxiii. 33.
"and they crucify him . . . and they crucified him."	"but having cru- cified him . . . and sitting-down they watched him <i>there</i> ."	" <i>there</i> they cruci- fied him."

[506] Luke's context differs so much from that of Matthew that this must perhaps not be regarded as an instance of agreement; for Matthew does not insert "there" in connection with the act of crucifying. Moreover the

<sup>1</sup> [504b] Mk. xv. 12 τί οὖν ποιήσω; D (writing -ε as -αι) has τι οὖν θελεταιποιήσω, of which the last letters might be corrupted into (or from) απολυσω.

We have seen above that απολυσω and απολεσω may have been interchanged. If θελεταιαπολεσω were written for θελεταιποιήσω in Mk. xv. 12 the meaning would become "what then? *Do you wish me to destroy* the king of the Jews?" This resembles John xix. 15 "*Shall I crucify* your king?"

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Mk. xv. 20 ἐξάγουσιν, "they *lead* him out" = Mt. xxvii. 31 (Lk. xxiii. 26) ἀπήγαγον, "*led* him away." There Mk. lays stress on the leading *out* from the city. Mt.-Lk. use the common term for leading to execution.

<sup>3</sup> [505a] Josh. xviii. 9 "they *came* (ἤνεγκαν)"; 1 Chr. xi. 18 "brought it" (LXX om. but B a mg. ἤλθον) = 2 S. xxiii. 16 "brought it," παρεγένοντο; Hag. ii. 16 "came," ἐβεβάλλετε.



Greek "and" resembles the Greek "there" both in writing and in pronunciation, and the two words are interchanged elsewhere in the account of the Passion,<sup>1</sup> so that the agreement, such as it is, may be merely casual.

But there are grounds for thinking that "there" proceeds from a Hebrew source, and that some Hebrew confusion is latent under Matthew's "*sitting down they watched him there. And they put* above his head his accusation . . ." Instead of "and they *put* (ἐπέθηκαν)," Mark and Luke state that there "*was* (ἦν)" an inscription. John, however, has "Pilate *put* (ἔθηκεν)." These facts point to the Hebrew idiom "and [one] put," capable of meaning "people put," as Mark and Luke seem to have understood it,<sup>2</sup> or (Matthew) "they (*i.e.* soldiers) put," or (John) "he (*i.e.* Pilate) put." Now the Hebrew for "he put" is ׀פ and for "there" is ׀פ, and, without vowel points, they are identical (׀פ). Hence in a passage of Habbakuk the two are confused. Also, in the very first instance in which "he put" occurs in the Bible, the LXX has "he ( $a_1$ ) *put* ( $a_2$ ) *there*," conflating the two meanings. It is possible that Matthew has done so here, preserving an original "put" but introducing a non-original "there."<sup>3</sup>

But, again, where an error of this kind occurs, the

<sup>1</sup> [506a] Mk. xv. 40 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες = Mt. xxvii. 55 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ (D substitutes καὶ γυναῖκες: Mk. xv. 47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία = Mt. xxvii. 61 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρίαμ. In Mk. xv. 40, the first Μαρία is preceded by καὶ "both," and Mt. xxvii. 61 may have corrupted ἡ δε κε (*i.e.* καὶ) Μαρίαμ into ἡ δεκεῖ M., which he read as ἦν δ' ἐκεῖ M.

In the LXX, the Greek "and (καὶ)" often introduces the apodosis. If an early Gospel had "when they came to Golgotha . . . and (κε or καὶ) (meaning "then") they crucified him," it would be natural to substitute ἐκεῖ, or ἐκεῖ.

It should be noted that Mk. xv. 25 ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν is followed by καὶ ἦν ἡ (D ην δε), Lk. xxiii. 38 ἦν δὲ καὶ (D + η). This exhibits a confusion arising from an oscillation between δε and καὶ, which was very likely to result in a blending of the two as δεκαί, corrected to ἐκεῖ.

<sup>2</sup> In three instances 1 S. xxx. 25, (?) Job xxxviii. 33, Jer. xii. 11 (A ἐγενήθη but LXX ἐτέθη), "put," ׀פ = ׀פ, = ׀פ.

<sup>3</sup> [506b] Jn. xix. 19 ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Hab. iii. 4 "there," ἔθετο: Gen. xxviii. 18 "that he *had-put*," LXX "that he had *put there*."

passage often shews other errors of the same nature. Now, in the two versions of David's final Psalm, Samuel has "keep" or "watch (שמר)" where the Psalm has "put (שום)." And there are two other passages at least where the LXX confuses the words. This suggests that Matthew's "they watched him" may be another marginal rendering of "put."<sup>1</sup>

Lastly, why should Matthew tell us that the soldiers "sat down"? Was this usual for Romans on guard? And even if it were, would it be worth inserting? It has been repeatedly stated that ס (or ס) which is (516a) almost identical with ב in Hebrew inscriptions of Christ's time, is frequently confused with the latter, so that שום might be confused with שוב. But the latter is frequently, by error (9), rendered "sit." Hence "sit" may here be part of a conflation of "put."

If this explanation is correct, Matthew's and Luke's use of "there" in the present passage does not arise from Greek corruption but from Hebrew.<sup>2</sup>

§ 71 (a). (*Mk.-Mt.*) "*his accusation*," omitted by *Lk. and Jn.*

[506 (i)] The following, though not verbally, exhibits practically an agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark, and one that appears to be somewhat more than a correction for definiteness.

Mk. xv. 26 (lit.).      Mt. xxvii. 37 (lit.).      Lk. xxiii. 38 (lit.).

"And there was      "And they put      "But there was  
the inscription of *above* (ἐπάνω) his      also an inscription

<sup>1</sup> [506c] 2 S. xxii. 44 "thou hast kept me (שמרתי)" φυλάξεις, Luc. εθου = Ps. xviii. 43 "thou hast *made* me (שמרת)" καταστήσεις; 1 S. ix. 24 "kept (שמר)," τέθειται, Ps. xxxix. 1 "I will *keep*," ἐθέμην.

<sup>2</sup> [506d] For confusion of שום and שוב, see Job xxxiv. 14, Is. xxviii. 25, and probably Gen. xxx. 36. It happens that Matthew's "sitting" is preceded by "casting lots." The Hebrew for the latter, הפיל (lit. "cause to fall," hence "make to lie down"), is rendered καθίζειν in Deut. xxv. 2, so that part of Matthew's conflation might be thus explained. And it must be admitted that a fourfold conflation ("sit," "guard," "there," "put") is very rare.

his cause [of punishment] (*αἰτίας*)<sup>1</sup> inscribed (*ἐπιγεγραμμένη*)."<sup>2</sup>

head his cause [of punishment] (*αἰτίαν*) written (*γεγραμμένην*)."

*over* (so R.V. but ? *upon*) him (*ἐπ' αὐτῷ*)."<sup>3</sup>

Compare :—

Jn. xix. 19.

Evang. Pet. § 4.

Diatess. li. 31.

"And Pilate wrote a title also and put it *upon* the cross (*ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ*)."

"And when they *lifted up* (*ᾠρθωσαν*) the cross they inscribed . . ."

"And Pilate wrote on a tablet the cause of his death and put it *on* the wood of the cross *above* his head."

<sup>1</sup> [506 (i) α] *Aitla*, when meaning "cause [of punishment]," might be rendered "crime," as in Jn. xix. 6, "I find no *crime* in him." It is rendered "cause of his death" in Diatess., and "crime" in SS (Mt.). When Lk. uses it thus, he gives the phrase in full, Acts xiii. 28, xxviii. 18 "cause of death (*αἰτίαν θανάτου*)."

In LXX, as the correct rendering of Heb., *aitla* occurs only in Gen. iv. 13 "my *punishment* (marg. *iniquity*) (*ἰν*)," Prov. xxviii. 17 (R.V.) "laden with the blood of (*דם* *psu*) . . ." *ἐν αἰτίᾳ φόνου*, prob. meaning "guilt."

<sup>2</sup> *Ἐπιγεγραμμένη* is rendered by R.V. here "written over," and *ἐπιγραφὴ* "superscription." Whatever the intention of R.V. may be—whether to harmonize Mk. with the other Evangelists or not—the translation is not justified by L. S., which does not recognize the term "superscription" for *ἐπιγραφὴ*, and which renders *ἐπιγράφω* "write *upon*," "inscribe," "put a name or title *on*" (the only instance of "over" being Plato *Phaedr.* p. 264 c *ἐπιγραμμα δὲ Μίδα φασὶν ἐπιγεγράφθαι*, (L. S.) "over, or on, the tomb of Midas"). R.V. renders Rev. xxi. 12, "and at the gates twelve angels and names *written thereon* (*ἐπιγεγραμμένα*)," and Acts xvii. 23, *βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπετέγραπτο*, "an altar with this *inscription*." So far as the Greek *ἐπιγράφω* is concerned, the writing may have been on any part of the cross, at the foot, or at the top: the word merely means "inscribe." In LXX *ἐπιγράφω* occurs six or seven times, and always in the sense of "inscribing," e.g. on a staff, a tablet, heart, hand, etc. (R.V. once (Is. xlv. 5) renders in text "*subscribe* with his hand," marg. "*write on* his hand"). It never means "writing over" in the sense of "writing high up," and when it = a Heb. word, the Heb. is (5) כתב, which simply means "write."

<sup>3</sup> [506 (i) δ] *Ἐπ' αὐτῷ* is rendered (Thayer) "over his head," but with no instance alleged from Gk. literature to shew that *ἐπὶ* with the dative of the person could have this meaning. "Put *upon*" in LXX seems mostly to have *ἐπὶ* with accus. of person, Exod. iii. 22, Lev. viii. 7 (A *αὐτῷ* without *ἐπὶ* as in Gen. xxii. 6), 2 K. v. 23, xi. 12, Is. xlii. 1, Ezek. xvi. 14. Acts xi. 19 (*τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ* (R.V.) "*about* Stephen"), and Acts v. 35 (*προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν*, (R.V.) "*as touching* these men") have not "put" in the context.



SS is wanting for John, but renders the Synoptists thus :—

Mk. (SS).	Mt. (SS).	Lk. (SS).
"And his accusation was written."	"And while they were sitting they wrote the crime. They set it <i>over</i> his head."	"And an inscription was written and placed <i>over</i> him."

The agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark consists in the statement that the inscription was "up-above (*ἐπάνω*)" or "upon (*ἐπὶ*)" something. John also adopts this correction. But the three correctors differ as to the object of the preposition: (Mt.) "his head," (Lk.) "him," (Jn.) "the cross." The Gospel of Peter has no preposition, but seems to imply "up" in "lifted up." These agreements point to a reading—whether of the Hebrew original or of a very early Hebrew gloss—that might mean "above him," or "above it," or "lift up." Lastly, the difficulty of Luke's apparently unexampled use of *ἐπὶ* with the dative to mean "over" would be removed if we could suppose that, as in two passages of the Acts, the preposition does not mean "over" but "about": and if the Hebrew original or gloss could include this meaning, it would have so much the more probability. Now all these conditions would be satisfied by the Hebrew על, "above" (or מעל, literally, "from above," but practically indistinguishable from "above"). This preposition may mean "above," "about," or "against." Moreover "about him (or, it)," or "above him (or, it)," עליו, might easily be confused with the verb עלה, "go up." Thus in Numb. xxi. 17, "spring-up (על)," is read by LXX as על followed by the article ה, i.e. עלה, and is rendered "upon the (*ἐπὶ τοῦ*)": and in 1 S. ii. 10, "against them (A.V. upon them), עליו, is spelt על in the Hebrew text, and is rendered by the LXX "went up." Such an original then might be



interpreted by Matthew as "above him," *i.e.* "over his head," by Luke as "concerning him," by John as "upon it," *i.e.* "upon the cross," which is amplified by Diatessaron as meaning strictly, not *on the cross*, but on a tablet placed at the top of the cross over Christ's head. Lastly, the Gospel of Peter appears to have taken עליו as a form of the verb עלה, so that the meaning was not "*upon the cross*," but "*on lifting up the cross*."

[506 (ii)] But is it likely—it may be asked—that Mark, the earliest Evangelist, misunderstood and corrupted so familiar and intelligible a word as "upon," and corrupted it into so unfamiliar and difficult a word as "cause of punishment"? It is in the highest degree unlikely. If therefore we can point to a Biblical word for "cause of punishment" that resembles the Hebrew for "above him (or, it)," it may be regarded as extremely probable that this was the original word, conflated by Matthew with the corrupt "above him," and dropped altogether (in favour of the corruption) by later authorities. Now Gesenius (ed. Buhl) expressly refers to the Greek word "cause of punishment" used in this passage (and Jn. xviii. 38) as corresponding to a word used thrice in Dan. vi. 4, 5 "The satraps sought to find *occasion* (*i.e.* cause of punishment) against Daniel." But the Aramaic word there used is עלה, which in Hebrew is a verb meaning "go up," *the very word mentioned above as being easily confused with עליו*, "upon him (or, it)."<sup>1</sup>

[506 (iii)] It is easy to understand that the author of the original Hebrew—writing (like Ben Sira) in a dead language, and occasionally inserting in his Biblical Hebrew an expression of New Hebrew or Aramaic origin—might select from Daniel the word in question, because it was the only word in the Bible that exactly suited his purpose. He wished to express that it was *an accusation, but a false one* ;

<sup>1</sup> "Upon it," referring to a feminine noun, would be עליה. This would be perhaps still more easily confused with עלה, "cause of punishment."

a "pretext," not an actual "offence." But unfortunately the word עֲלָה—especially in the participial form when it is written עוֹלָה—is very easily confused with another, עוֹלָה, meaning "iniquity." Thus, in Job xxxvi. 33, עוֹלָה, in the sense "cometh up," is rendered by the LXX "iniquity" (ἀδικία), and in Is. lxi. 8, where עוֹלָה probably means "iniquity," the R.V. gives the alternative of rendering it (in the sense of "lifting up") as "burnt offering." Also, in the very passage of Daniel above-quoted, whereas Theodotion thrice renders the word exactly, "pretext (πρόφασις)," the LXX, in its loose paraphrase, either drops the word altogether, or implies it in the words "could not find *sin or ignorance* against Daniel about which they might accuse him to the king."<sup>1</sup> Many Christian readers may experience a slight feeling of shock at the above-quoted words from SS, "While they were sitting they wrote *the crime*." But this was a natural sense in which to take the Aramaic word, and perhaps Mark took it so himself, though of course he meant "the [alleged] *crime*." Whatever Mark may have meant, the motives for altering his language must have been very strong; and, on the hypothesis of an original Aramaic עֲלָה, the justification for a slight alteration that made excellent sense might well seem overwhelming.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is parallel to Dan. vi. 4 (Theod.) καὶ πᾶσαν πρόφασιν καὶ παράπτωμα καὶ ἀμβλάκημα οὐχ εὗρον κατ' αὐτοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> [506 (iii) a] It has been shewn (Black, *Enc. Bibl.* ii. p. 1768 foll.) that Jn. as a rule supports and explains Mk. where Lk. deviates from Mk. All the more remarkable is it to find Jn. thrice expressly using this rare word of Mk.'s with a negative, Jn. xviii. 38 "I find no *crime* (αἰτία) in him" (comp. Jn. xix. 4, 6). Lk. avoids the noun, but thrice uses the adjective, Lk. xxiii. 4 "I find nothing *criminal* (αἰτιῶν) in this man" (comp. Lk. xxiii. 14, 22). Considering the extreme rarity of these words, is it reasonable to suppose that all these uses of αἰτία and αἰτιῶν in the same context are a mere coincidence, instead of being attempts of the later Evangelists to correct what seemed to be a slip of the earliest one? Mk. seemed to speak of Christ's "crime" as written on the cross: "Not so," say Lk. and Jn., "Pilate thrice said, 'I find *no crime* (or, *nothing criminal*) in him.'"

[506 (iii) δ] As the rendering of Mk. xv. 26 "And there was the inscription of his cause [of punishment]," Delitzsch gives "And there was a writing of the word

§ 72. *The titles of Christ*

Mk. xv. 32.	Mt. xxvii. 40, 42, 43.	Lk. xxiii. 35, 37.
"the Christ the king of Israel."	"if thou art <i>the Son of God</i> . . . he is king of Israel . . . for he said, I am <i>the Son of God</i> ."	"if this is the Christ of God the Elect" (or, as SS, "the Christ, the Elect of God," but D, "if thou art <i>the Son of God</i> , if Christ, if the Elect") . . . (37) If thou art the king of the Jews."

[507] This can hardly be called an instance of agreement against Mark. Above (483) where Mark had "the Son of the Blessed," Matthew and Luke had, in different contexts, "the Son of God"; and it is therefore natural that the latter term should be repeated by those who there employed it. But the context is so different that there is not the least reason for supposing that Luke borrowed it from Matthew.

[508] It is however possible that Luke, who omits "king of Israel,"<sup>1</sup> may have rendered "Israel" by resolving it into its component parts, "the righteous one of God." Above, Luke assigned the phrase "Christ [that is] king," to the chief priests when speaking to Pilate. Here he may have

of his *guilt* (אשמה)." Reasons have been given (506 (ii)) for preferring the word suggested by Gesenius, עלה. But it is not improbable that, in the conflict of opinion that arose on the meaning of the ambiguous word עלה, some—who took the word as meaning "imputed offence," and not as meaning "above" or "upon"—may have written this word in the margin. If it was thus written, those who rejected every allusion to "crime" or "offence," might be disposed to take אשמה, "guilt" as an error for אשמה, "a (military) watch," or "guard." This might have some bearing on Mt. xxvii. 36 "watched," although it may be adequately explained (506) as a conflation of שום read as שר.

<sup>1</sup> Lk. xxiii. 37 assigns "king of the Jews" to the soldiers, but nowhere makes mention of "king of Israel," which Mark and Matthew assign to the chief priests.



considered that "Christ," since it might mean "anointed [king]," made "king" superfluous in the mouths of Jews speaking among themselves. Hence, Luke may have preferred to read Mark's "Christ, the king of Israel" as being "the Christ, the King, the Righteous one of God," which he paraphrased into "the Christ of God, the Elect."<sup>1</sup>

### § 73. *The description of Christ's death*

Mk. xv. 37<sup>2</sup> (lit.).

Mt. xxvii. 50 (lit.).

Lk. xxiii. 46 (lit.).

[509] "But Jesus having sent forth a loud cry expired."

"But Jesus having again exclaimed *with* a loud cry sent forth his (lit. the) spirit."

"And having cried *with* a loud cry Jesus said, Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit. But having said this he expired."<sup>3</sup>

[510] Confusion may have arisen, 1st, from the Hebrew idiom "he *gave with* a cry, or voice," occasionally used to mean "he *gave* a cry," 2nd, from the similarity of "his soul

<sup>1</sup> [508a] The word רַחַם "right" = sometimes "right (in the sight of)," hence εὐδοκεῖν (1), ἀρέσκειν (2). It = (1) ὁσιος applied to God, but never ἐκλεκτος. Possibly motive, as well as variations in the text, may have induced Luke to avoid applying the term "king" to Christ. It was calculated to excite the suspicion and hostility of Roman magistrates. Jn. makes it clear, in a dialogue between Christ and Pilate, that "king" is meant in a spiritual sense.

<sup>2</sup> In order to shew the parallelism, the Greek words (1) φωνή, (2) κράζειν, are here rendered (1) "cry," (2) "exclaim," though φωνή should rather be "voice" and κράζειν "cry." Also ἀφιέναι ("utter") is rendered "send forth," in order that the same English verb may be used both with "cry" and with "spirit."

In Mk. xv. 37, SS has "cried *with* a loud voice," L has φωνη μεγάλην (sic).

<sup>3</sup> [509a] In Lk. (not in Mk.) the translation of SS gives "ended" as a marg. altern. for "expired." The word "go forth," when used causatively as "send forth" = (in Aram.) "bring to an end," "finish." Comp. Ezr. vi. 15 "this house was *finished* (אֲשֵׁר), ἐτέλεσαν = 1 Esdr. vii. 5 συνετελέσθη. Comp. Jn. xix. 30 τετέλεσται, "It is *finished*." Gesen. (Mitchell) derives אֲשֵׁר from אֲשֵׁר, Buhl does not. Levy (iv. p. 548 (a)) follows Gesen. and says that it is frequent in Targums, in the sense of "completing," quoting a comment on Gen. xxxii. 27 ("I will not let thee go till thou hast blessed me") as follows, "That is as though one were to say to the labourer, 'Hast thou completed the labour (אֲשֵׁר) then take thy wage (סִיבָה).'"



went-forth" and "he *caused-to-go-forth* his soul." If so, the original was, "And Jesus gave *with* a loud cry"; and probably it continued in the words used to describe the death of Rachel, "and his soul went forth."

[511] Mark (since "*give* a cry" is not Greek) translated this idiomatically thus, "*sent forth* a loud cry and expired."<sup>1</sup>

[512] Matthew, erroneously retaining "with," and probably taking "went" causatively, interpreted it thus: "sent forth, *with* a loud cry, and *caused to go forth*, his soul," taking "sent forth and caused to go forth" as an emphatic statement of the fact that Jesus *dismissed His own soul*. Only, instead of "soul," he prefers "spirit" or "breath," which indeed is etymologically contained in Mark's "ex-(s)pire."<sup>2</sup>

[513] Luke takes the words as indicating that Jesus "sent forth a loud cry [saying] (459 (i)) *that he caused-to-go-forth* his soul." This harmonized with the words of the

<sup>1</sup> [511a] Comp. Ps. lxxviii. 33 "He uttereth his voice," lit. "will give *in* (or *with*) his voice," δώσει ἐν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτοῦ (KR<sup>a</sup> om. εν, R<sup>b</sup> φωνην). The Heb. idiom recurs in Jer. xii. 8 and Ps. xlv. 6, but the LXX om. "in." Elsewhere the Heb. has, "gave his voice," as in Gen. xlv. 2 "he gave his voice in weeping," LXX ἀφῆκεν φωνὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ (R.V. "he wept aloud"). The Greek ἀφίεναι is also used in Gen. xxxv. 18 (lit.) "in the going forth of her soul," LXX "when she was sending forth her soul," ἐν τῷ ἀφίεναι αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν (R.V. "as her soul was in departing" πνεῦμα πνεύμα).

[511b] There is Biblical precedent for an active form of "sending forth," lit. "blowing" one's soul, in (Gesen. Oxf.) Jer. xv. 9, Job xi. 20, xxxi. 39. But that word πνῆ ("blow," or "puff," often used of "blowing" a fire) is connected in Job xi. 20 (πνῆ "breathing out") with "the hope of the wicked," and its use in Jer. xv. 8-9 ("I have caused anguish . . . to fall upon her suddenly . . . she hath given up the ghost") does not seem likely to commend the word to an Evangelist describing the death of Christ. Moreover, none of its renderings in LXX (Jer. xv. 9 ἀπεκάκησεν, Job xi. 20 om. or paraphr., Job xxxi. 39 ἐκλαβὼν ἐλύπησα) resemble the Synoptic Greek, which, on the other hand, in Mk. and Mt. (ἀφίει, ἀφῆκεν), somewhat resembles the LXX Greek describing the "going forth" of Rachel's soul.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. also adds "again." Possibly he wished to prevent any readers from taking the words as referring to the *previous* cry (om. by Luke), and to guard against such an interpretation as, "Now Jesus had [as I have said] cried aloud."

Psalmist "Into thine hand I commend my spirit."<sup>1</sup> Luke therefore quotes these words as representing what Jesus said.

[514] John does not mention the quotation from the Psalmist, but gives, as the last utterance, "*It is finished.*" The Hebrew "*went forth*" has the meaning of "*it is finished*" in Aramaic; and it (509a) is so translated in Ezra and in the parallel Esdras.

§ 74. (Mk.) "*he expired,*" (Mt.-Lk.) "*coming to pass*" or "*came to pass*"

Mk. xv. 39.

Mt. xxvii. 54.

Lk. xxiii. 47.

"... that he thus expired."

"... the earthquake and the [things] - that - were coming-to-pass."

"... that which had come to pass."

It has been shewn (*Clue*, 172-6) that the original was probably "the-things-that-had-come-to-pass," and that this was paraphrased by Mark, and conflated by Matthew with "earthquake."

§ 75. (Mk.) "*in Galilee,*" (Mt.-Lk.) "*from Galilee*"

Mk. xv. 41.

Mt. xxvii. 55.

Lk. xxiii. 49.

[515] "who, when he was in Galilee, used-to-follow (*imperf.*) him and used-to-minister to him" (D reads "followed," SS "those who came with him from Galilee").

"those - who followed (*past tense*) Jesus from Galilee, ministering to him."

"and women, those who-had-been-together - following (*particip. pres.*) him from Galilee."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xxxi. 5. The Jewish Prayer-Book (ed. Singer, p. 317) prescribes these words among the final utterances on the death-bed.

<sup>2</sup> [515a] Lk. xxiii. 49 συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γ., R.V. "following with him from Galilee," which is the most natural meaning of the words. But whom,

[516] Owing to the similarity of the Hebrew letters meaning "in" and "from"—which is the cause of multitudes of errors in the LXX—"who *in* Galilee used to follow him" might be confused with "who *from* Galilee followed him." Compare the two following parallel passages, where the same Hebrew is quite differently translated by LXX: (i) "and they made a conspiracy against him *in* Jerusalem and he fled to Lachish," (ii) "they made an assault upon him, and *from* Jerusalem he fled to Lachish."<sup>1</sup>

### § 76. *Joseph of Arimathaea*

Mk. xv. 42, 43 (lit.).

Mt. xxvii. 57, 58.

Lk. xxiii. 50-52.

"And now . . . having come Joseph from Arimathaea (a councillor of-honourable-estate<sup>2</sup> who also himself was awaiting the kingdom of God)

"But . . . there came a man of-wealth from Arimathaea (his *name* [was] Joseph) who also had himself become a disciple to Jesus. *This (man)*

"And behold a man by *name* Joseph, a councillor by-position (*ὑπάρχων*), a man good and just—*this (?) (man)* had not consented to the

or what, had they been "following, *with* Jesus"? Could "follow" mean "making [the Passover] pilgrimage"? Mk. v. 37 *μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθήσαι* certainly means "following [Jairus] *with* Jesus"; but there the insertion of *μετ' αὐτοῦ* prevents ambiguity. Mk. xiv. 51 *συννηκολούθει αὐτῷ* may mean "a certain young man had been following him [*i.e.* Jesus] with [the rest of the disciples]," or "continued to follow Jesus with [the guards who led him away]," or (as R.V.) "followed [the guards along] with him," *i.e.* along with Jesus.

Possibly—according to the analogy of *παρακολουθεῖν*, "follow *by the side of*"—*συνακολουθεῖν*, "follow *along with*," is used for "be in close attendance on." In LXX it occurs only in 2 Macc. ii. 4 and 6. In ii. 6 certainly, and ii. 4 probably, it = "following [Jeremiah] together," not "along with" Jeremiah.

<sup>1</sup> [516a] 2 K. xiv. 19 = 2 Chr. xxv. 27. Comp. 2 K. xiv. 13 "in (*ἐν*) the wall" = 2 Chr. xxv. 23 "from (*ἀπό*) the wall": Dan. i. 19 "*among* them all," LXX *ἐν*, Theod. (as Heb. *-ב*) *ék*; Ezek. xvi. 6 "*in* thy blood," *ék* τοῦ αἱματος σου: Jer. vi. 1 "in Tekoa," LXX *ἐν*, but A *ék*: 2 K. xix. 35 "*in* the camp," *ἐν*, but in the parallel Is. xxxvii. 36 *ék*. In Sir. xl. 28, Heb. has *מִי*, "from me," for *בִּי*, "my son," which the Editors adopt. The confusion of the Heb. *m* ("from") and *b* ("in") is apparent in Is. xxxix. 1 "Merodach" = 2 K. xx. 12 "Berodach." I am informed by Professor W. H. Bennett that B and M, in Hebrew inscriptions of Christ's time, are almost identical.

<sup>2</sup> "Of-honourable-estate," *εὐσχήμων*.



having taken-courage	having	come	to	council	and	their
came in to Pilate."	Pilate."			action — from Ari-		
				mathaea, a city of the		
				Jews, who awaited		
				the kingdom of God :		
				— <i>this</i> (man) having		
				come to Pilate."		

(i) *Mt.-Lk.'s agreements ; "this (man)," "name"*

[517] In early Greek editions of Mark, the harshness caused by the distance of "Joseph" from "came" might be felt to require a remedy, which was supplied in the margin by the pronoun "this (man)" (used once by Matthew and twice by Luke). But the later Evangelists might also be returning to the Hebrew in this insertion. Compare the introduction of Deborah : "Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, *she* judged Israel at that time."<sup>1</sup> Here Tischendorf gives the Greek rendering as "this [woman]," while Swete gives it as "(she) herself." Possibly Mark rendered it in the words "*himself* was awaiting . . . [and] having taken courage . . ." The addition of "name"—to introduce the first mention of Joseph—is so natural as to require no comment.

(ii) (*Mk.*) "*of honourable estate,*" (*Mt.*) "*of wealth,*" (*Lk.*) "*good and just*"

[518] The word used by Delitzsch to render (Mark) "of honourable estate" is נכבד, the passive of a verb כבד, of which the radical meaning is "weight." It is often used with reference to what St. Paul calls the "weight of *glory*," so that the participle (niph.) (נכבד) means "glorious" or "honourable." Only on one occasion does the adjective, נבד, refer to "weight of *wealth*" where Abraham is described as (Gen. xiii. 2) "*rich* (נבד) exceedingly in cattle."

<sup>1</sup> Judg. iv. 4 היא, Tisch. αὐτή, Swete αὐτή.



But the noun is about eight times used of "wealth."<sup>1</sup> There would therefore be some slight justification for rendering the participle "wealthy," and this rendering would commend itself to an Evangelist that saw in this epithet a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 9) that the Messiah should be "with *the rich* in his death." It is true that the LXX gives a different rendering of Isaiah's words, and that Justin Martyr understood them to mean that the rich would be *slain in vengeance for the Messiah's death*. But Matthew's applications of prophecy elsewhere, *e.g.* to the return of the child Jesus from Egypt and to the purchase of "the potter's field," shew that he might discern fulfilments of prophecy where later writers failed to follow him.<sup>2</sup>

Luke, if he had before him Mark's Hebrew reading (נכבד), and if he knew, and disliked, the tradition interpreting it as "wealthy," may have paraphrased the Hebrew as meaning "respected [because of his *moral* qualities]," *i.e.* "good and just."

[519] It ought, however, to be added that other causes beside translation from Hebrew may account for Luke's correction of Mark. The Greek word used by Mark to mean "of honourable estate (εὐσχήμων)" was used ambiguously by writers of the time. Plutarch and Josephus (as Wetstein's commentary on Mark attests) used it to mean "of good position" implying noble birth and wealth. But the same commentator shews that the Greek grammarians with one consent condemned this use of the word as a mark of ignorance and bad breeding. Perhaps Mark did

<sup>1</sup> Gesen. Oxf. gives Gen. xxxi. 1, Is. x. 3, lxi. 6, lxvi. 11, 12, Nah. ii. 10, Ps. xlix. 17, 18. R.V. sometimes follows Gesen. Oxf. in margin.

<sup>2</sup> Justin Mart. *Τρυφή*. § 32 ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν ὧν προανιστόρησα . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ τοὺς πλουσίους θανατωθήσεσθαι, referring to § 13 (p. 230 E) δώσω . . . τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. Comp. Tertull. *Marc.* iii. 23 "dati sunt . . . locupletes pro morte eius, qui scilicet et a Juda traditionem redemerant et a militibus falsum testimonium cadaveris subrepti," *i.e.* the "rich," the rulers of the Jews, were punished [? in the fall of Jerusalem] for purchasing the treachery of Judas and the mendacity of the guards of Christ's tomb.

not use it thus. But Matthew's parallel, and the condemnations of the grammarians, justify the belief that in the first century multitudes of illiterate Christians would interpret the word in the popular and degraded sense, very nearly as "respectable" is used by some people in England, and as the Latin "*honesta*" is used by Petronius (Wetstein) to describe a matron "of good position" who acts in a very discreditable way.<sup>1</sup>

Nor should it be omitted that Jewish literature itself affords one or two instances of the connection between "councillors" and "rich men." For example, a tradition mentioning Nicodemus Ben Gorion as one of three "rich men" supporting the population of Jerusalem when besieged by Titus, appears in another form mentioning Ben Nicodemus and Ben Gorion as two of four "councillors" supporting the people<sup>2</sup>: and Levy quotes a tradition "This man is rich (עתיר), we will make him *councillor* (בוליתוס), i.e. *βουλευτής* in Hebrew letters."<sup>3</sup>

The restoration of the Original is complicated by the fact that John introduces Nicodemus as co-operating with Joseph. If it could be shewn that ק (*k*) is often interchanged with כ (hard *c*), it would be easy to allege grounds for believing that נכבד, "honourable," was a corruption of נקיד, part of the name "Nicodemus." Hostile Jewish tradition derisively mentions a certain בקי, "the innocent," as one of five disciples of Jesus, and it is not improbable

<sup>1</sup> Wetst. quotes Phryn. p. 146, Suidas, and Etymol. as condemning the popular use, Plut. *Parall. Gr. et Rom.* 15, and Joseph. *Vit.* 9, as instances of the popular use, and Petron. 140 "Matrona, inter primas *honesta*, . . . quae multas saepe haereditates officio aetatis extorserat . . ." Prov. xi. 23 (the only instance of the word in LXX) certainly uses it in a moral signification, and so probably does Luke in Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Levy, i. p. 200 (*a*) and Hor. Hebr. on Jn. iii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Levy, i. p. 199 (*b*) and see (ib.) the mistake that caused a Jewish writer to take the first part of the New Hebrew word for "councillor" (בולי) as meaning "rich." In Biblical Hebrew, "councillor" would be עץ, or rendered by a paraphrase.

that he was identical with Nicodemus. But the discussion of these points must be reserved for a commentary.

### § 77. *The burial of Jesus*

Mk. xv. 46.

Mt. xxvii. 59.

Lk. xxiii. 53.

"bound - [him] -  
round in the linen."

"*wrapped it* in  
clean linen."

"*wrapped it* in  
linen."

[520] Mark's rather rare word is used in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians concerning those who are "*bound-round* in the chains" of martyrdom; and there (as also in two passages of the Septuagint) it is altered by MSS. or Editors.<sup>1</sup> Mark's preceding words, "having taken *him* down," oblige us to repeat "him" as the object of "bound round." This was naturally repulsive to many believers—that Christ's friends should be described as "binding," or rather, perhaps, as "fettering" Him. Consequently the Corrector substituted "*wrapped it*," and Matthew and Luke adopted the alteration.

[521] Not so John. He perhaps felt that the "binding" must be insisted on for two reasons. First, it was of use as an answer to any who might assert that Jesus was not dead, and that He awoke from a swoon and left the grave in a natural way. Secondly, he might see a mystical meaning in the act; for "the binding of Isaac," a type of Christ, was a favourite topic with the Jews. At all events, distinguishing between "binding" and "wrapping" (for he uses both words), he says that Christ's friends "took the body of Jesus and *bound* it with linen cloths," and subsequently that the two disciples saw the napkin that had covered the head "*wrapped up* (or, *rolled up*) in a place by itself."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Polyc. *Philipp.* § 1 (Lightf.), 1 S. xxi. 9 ἐνελημμένη (Α εἰλημμένη) and so in Is. xi. 5 εἰλημένος (Α εἰλημμένος).

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xv. 46 ἐνέλιψεν, Mt. xxvii. 59, Lk. xxiii. 53 ἐνετύλιξεν. Jn. xix. 40 "bound," ἐθῆσαν, Jn. xx. 7 ἐντετυλιγμένον. R.V. transl. ἐντυλίσσειν "wrapped" in Mt.-Lk., but "rolled up" in Jn.



§ 78. (*Mk.*) "in a white robe," (*Mt.-Lk.*) ". . . lightning"

<i>Mk.</i> xvi. 5.	<i>Mt.</i> xxviii. 2, 3.	<i>Lk.</i> xxiv. 4.
"a young-man clothed in a white robe."	"an angel . . . his appearance as <i>lightning</i> and his garment white as snow" (SS omits "white").	"two men . . . in raiment [bright-as-] <i>lightning</i> (ἀστραπ-τούσην)" (SS "dazzling").

Compare the parallel passages in the account of the Transfiguration:—

<i>Mk.</i> ix. 3.	<i>Mt.</i> xvii. 2.	<i>Lk.</i> ix. 29.
"And his garments became flashing, white exceedingly [so] as fuller on earth cannot thus make white" (SS "became white like snow," D "white exceedingly as snow [so] as no man can whiten on earth").	"But his garments became white as the light (SS omits "white," D "white as snow").	"and his garments white [flashing-as-] lightning (ἐξαστραπτων)."

(a) (i) *Variations in the account of the Transfiguration*

[522 (i)] A key to some of these variations is suggested by a passage of the recently-discovered Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, "His might marketh out the *lightning*." Here the Hebrew is ברק, *i.e.* "lightning," but the scribe has placed in the margin the transposed letters בקר, *i.e.* "the morning-light," while the Septuagint has "snow," which implies the reading ברד (properly "hail"). Similarly, in 2 S. xxii. 15, "lightning (ברק)," the version of Lucianus has conflated "lightning" by adding "hail (ברד)." <sup>1</sup> This shews

<sup>1</sup> [522 (i) a] Sir. xliii. 13. Comp. the account of the Transfiguration in the *Acts of John* § 3 "At another time He taketh me and James and John into the



how "snow," "lightning," and "light," might be interchanged in translating from Hebrew.

(a) (ii) "*Lightning*" connected with the Messiah

[522 (ii)] In the Apocalypse of Baruch, a document, incorporated in that work and dated by the Editor 50-70 A.D., begins and ends with a mention of "lightning": and the Editor says, "The lightning on the cloud symbolises the Messiah." It is of a beneficent nature, as may be seen from the following: "And I saw after these things that lightning which I had seen on the summit of the cloud, that it held it fast and made it descend to the earth. Now that lightning *shone exceedingly, so as to illuminate the whole earth and it healed those regions where the last waters had descended and wrought devastation.*"<sup>1</sup> Compare:—

Mt. xxiv. 27.

Lk. xvii. 24.

"For as the lightning cometh forth from the east and appeareth as far as the west, so shall be the presence of the Son of man."

"For as the lightning (noun) *lightening* (verb) from this quarter of heaven to this quarter of heaven shineth, so shall be the Son of man."

Why should the lightning proceed—as Matthew says—from "the east"? What the sense requires (viz. the universality of the illumination) seems better expressed by

mountain where His custom was to pray: and we beheld [in] Him (*εἶδομεν* [*? + ἐν*] *αὐτῷ*) such a light as it is not possible for man using *corruptible* word to set forth of what kind it was (*ἀνθρώπῳ χρώμενον* (sic) *λόγῳ φθαρτῷ ἐκφέρειν οὐκ ἔστιν*)." <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [522 (ii) a] Apoc. Baruch, ed. Charles §§ 53-74. On the date, see p. 87. On the "lightning on the cloud" see p. 88, n. 8, which refers to Levy iii. 271, 422, as shewing that the Messiah was called in Jewish tradition "the cloud-man" (from Dan. vii. 13), and "the son of the cloud." It will be remembered that a "cloud" is mentioned in the account of the Transfiguration, which is preceded by the words (Mt. xvi. 28) "There are some of those standing here who shall not taste of death till they have seen the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Baruch and Luke. Matthew's text may with considerable probability be explained by reference to the fact that in two passages of O.T. (Gesen. Oxf. ברק) a slight confusion has been caused in the Hebrew text by the phrase "lighten lightnings." This, and the frequent errors in LXX arising from reduplications of Hebrew verbs (or verb and verbal noun), indicate that the original was as Luke has it. Matthew probably took the second ברק as בקר "dawn," which he erroneously interpreted as "the sunrise," or "east," modifying the sentence to suit his interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

(a) (iii) "*Lightning*" misunderstood in the account of the  
*Transfiguration*

[522 (iii)] In addition to the above-mentioned possibilities of error there is the fact that, whereas ברק in Biblical Hebrew means only "lightning," it includes, in New Hebrew, the meanings "bright," "shining," etc. It can be applied even to the colour of a wine or of a horse, but, in particular, the New Hebrew בורקי, "the shining one," means the morning star.<sup>2</sup> Hence Christ's saying that the Son of man would be "like lightning" might be taken by some to mean "like the morning-star" and by others "like light." The former tradition is found in the second Epistle of Peter—a spurious and late production, but still one that may contain early traditions, especially concerning the Trans-

<sup>1</sup> [522 (ii) δ] In O.T. "lightning," when used literally, is mostly pl. In Ps. cxliv. 6, 2 S. xxii. 15, the Heb. has sing., but Gesen. Oxf. (p. 140 b) would read the pl., ברקים. If a translator had this phrase with the pl. before him, and was not aware of the plural use, he might take the final ם as the preposition "from." But "lightens from the lightning" (ברק) would make no sense. "Lightens from the dawn" (בקר) might well seem to make very good sense to a translator who thought that the phrase could mean "from the east." The same kind of mistake was made by the author of *Eothen*, which means, in Greek, "from the dawn," but not "from the east."

<sup>2</sup> Levy, i. p. 270 (δ).

figuration, which the author professes to have seen.<sup>1</sup> The latter tradition, or at least one that lays stress on "light," is found in Matthew's account of the Transfiguration and also in that quoted (522 (i) *a*) from the Acts of John. Thus the usage of New Hebrew would facilitate a substitution of "light," "brilliancy," or other synonyms—either as Greek interpretations, or as New Hebrew glosses—for an original "lightning."

(a) (iv) (*Mk.*) "*So as no fuller on earth can whiten them*"

[522 (iv)] The question is, whether this tradition of Mark is entirely distinct from the parallels in Matthew and Luke, or based on a different interpretation of the same original. It was shewn (522 (ii) *b*) that Matthew—in a passage in which he and Luke record a saying of Christ about the Son of man—may have interpreted "lighten (ברק)," when preceded by *m*, the sign of the plural in the preceding "lightnings," as "*from* the east," mistaking final *m*, which has a plural force, for initial *m*, which has a prepositional force, meaning "from," "after," "more than," etc. Now Luke's strong word ἐξαστράπτων, "sending-forth-lightnings," suggests that the Hebrew Original may have here, too, contained the same reduplication ("lightnings it lightened"). But if it did, it was open to interpreters to take the plural *m* as meaning "more than," beside taking "lightning" as "light, or brilliant." Thus, the first half of the reduplication being rendered "light, or brilliant, *more than*," it would remain to extract from the last half, ברק, some appropriate sense.

By dropping the last letter of ברק, Mark would obtain בר (connected with בור "purify"), a word that means "lye," or "soap": or by reading בור he would obtain "purify." Then the sentence would mean "brilliant beyond [cleansing

<sup>1</sup> [522 (iii) *a*] 2 Pet. i. 19 φωσφόρος. In LXX this word does not occur, but ἑωσφόρος occurs (7), once = (Job. xi. 17) בקר, but mostly (4) = שחר (ם).



with] soap, or beyond purifying." This he might interpret as meaning "beyond all cleansing [of garments] that can be obtained on earth." The cleansing of garments implied cleansing by a "fuller." Hence "fuller" would be inserted to particularise the kind of cleansing.

On the other hand, by reading מִדְּבַר "more than *word*," instead of מִבֶּר "more than *soap*" or מִבֶּרֶר "more than *purifying*,"<sup>1</sup> another Evangelist might extract the meaning "too bright to express in words upon earth," i.e. "too bright for any one to set forth using mortal and corruptible words," and such a tradition appears to have been adopted in the passage quoted above from the apocryphal Acts of John.<sup>2</sup>

### (a) (v) "*Lightning*" in *Daniel*

[522 (v)] Lest we should be disposed to assume, from the antecedent considerations, that "lightning (בֶּרֶק)," and nothing else, must have been the basis of the Synoptic variations, it will be well to be reminded of other possible hypotheses.

In the following passage, "lightning" is connected with

<sup>1</sup> For the converse of this corruption, see Cant. viii. 5 "from the wilderness (מִדְּבַר)" LXX "coloured *white*, λελευκατισμένη" (for -κανθισμένη, as  $\mu\Lambda$ ), (leg. ברד instead of רבר).

<sup>2</sup> [522 (iv) a] The wording in the Acts of John is worth considering in relation to a hypothetical Hebrew original, "soap." In Is. i. 25, כֶּבֶר i.e. "as [with] lye, potash, or alkali," is rendered ἐς καθάρων. But in Mal. iii. 2 "fuller's soap (כְּרִית)," LXX has, for "soap," ποία, a word not recognized by L. S. and altered by  $\mu$  into πλοια. The Gk. ποία, for "soap," occurs elsewhere only in Jer. ii. 22 (Ἀν ποαν). Suppose, then, that an early Evangelist had before him a Greek tradition about "a brilliancy such as it is not possible for corruptible man to produce by [fuller's] soap," οἷοισιν οὐκ ἐστὶν δυνατόν ἀνθρώπῳ φθαρτῷ ἐκφέρειν (cf. Is. liv. 16 where ἐκφέρειν is used of the production of a sword by a smith) ποία. This might be corrected in the margin by adding "by word," intended as a substitute for "by soap" (i.e. כֶּבֶר for כְּרִית). The Gk. for this would be χρωμένῳ λόγῳ, the accus. χρώμενον (instead of -ένφ) being very natural in a gloss of this kind. If this was included in the text by conflation, the result would be "such as it is not possible for a man using *corruptible speech*"—a very remarkable expression—"to produce (or, set forth) (ἐκφέρειν) by soap (ποία)": and then it would be almost inevitable that ποία should be treated as part of the familiar οὗτος, "of what sort," and altered to οὗτος ἦν, which is now in the text (522 (i) a).



a figure seen in a vision by Daniel. The Apocalypse quotes the passage freely, applying it to Christ, but substitutes other words for the clause about "lightning" and for the preceding clause. It will be instructive to compare the passage of Daniel in the versions of LXX and Theodotion, with the version in the Apocalypse, and to endeavour to explain the Apocalyptic deviation. The R.V. of Daniel need not be given separately, as it is adequately represented by Theodotion. The lightning-passage in Daniel, and the corresponding passage in the Apocalypse, are italicized.

Dan. x. 5-6 (Theod.).

Dan. x. 5-6 (LXX).

Rev. i. 12-15.

"And I lifted my eyes and saw and behold a (lit. one) man clothed in bad-dein<sup>1</sup> (R.V. linen) and his loins [were] girt about with gold of Ophaz<sup>2</sup>: [*and his body like tharseis* (R.V. *the beryl*), and

"And I lifted my eyes and saw and behold a (lit. one) man clothed in linen<sup>1</sup> and (*a<sub>1</sub>*) [as to] his loins [he was] girt about with linen and (*a<sub>2</sub>*) from his middle [there was] light<sup>2</sup>: [*and his mouth like*

"And having turned I saw . . . one like the Son of man, clothed in a long robe<sup>1</sup> and girt about at the breasts with a girdle of gold<sup>2</sup> [*but his head and his hair [were] white like white wool*

<sup>1</sup> [522 (v) a] "Baddein," a transliteration of ברים, rendered in parall. LXX βύσσιννα, "linen," and in Rev. ποδήρη, "long-robe." Ezek. ix. 2 describes a man "clothed in linen (ברים) (ἐνδεδυκὼς ποδήρη) with a writer's ink-horn by his side," and W. H. refer to Ezek. ix. 2 as quoted in Rev. here. But the following reasons make it more probable that Rev. is quoting a transl. of Daniel and not Ezek.: (1) The "man" spoken of in Ezek. appears to be a subordinate minister, far below the Son of man; (2) Rev. uses ἐνδεδυμένος with Dan., and not ἐνδεδυκὼς with Ezek.; (3) Rev.'s rendering of "linen" by ποδήρης, "long robe," is a very natural one, and may easily have been adopted independently by a translator of Ezek. and a translator of Daniel.

<sup>2</sup> [522 (v) b] "And his loins girt about with gold-of (כחם) Uphaz (אֹפָז)," has been variously translated, partly from corruption, partly from motives of seemliness. ; 1 "Loins" is transl. correctly by LXX (which conflates) in *a<sub>1</sub>*, but paraphrased in *a<sub>2</sub>* as "from his middle." It is rendered by Rev. "his breasts" for seemliness.

"Gold (כחם)" is transl. incorrectly by LXX in *a<sub>1</sub>* as "linen (? leg. ברים)." Perhaps, in *a<sub>1</sub>*, LXX read אֹפָז, "Uphaz," as אֶפְדוֹ, "ephod," and loosely rendered the two nouns together as "linen," owing to the frequency of the "*linen* ephod." In *a<sub>2</sub>*, LXX read אֹפָז as אור, "light." Rev. took אֹפָז, "Uphaz," as אֹר, "girdle."

his countenance like of the sea, and his like snow<sup>1</sup>]: and his  
 the appearance of countenance like the eyes like a flame of  
 lightning<sup>1</sup>]: and his appearance of light- fire and his feet like  
 eyes like torches of ning<sup>1</sup>]: and his eyes (lit.) chalcolibanon  
 fire and his arms and like torches of fire and (χαλκολιβάνῳ, R. V.  
 his legs (R.V. feet) his arms and his feet burnished brass) as if  
 like the appearance like brass that-sends- it had been refined in  
 of brass flashing forth-lightning."<sup>2</sup> a furnace."<sup>2</sup>  
 . . . "2

(a) (vi) "*Chalcolibanon*"

[522 (vi)] The variations in the last sentences of the three above-quoted passages, and, in particular, the Apocalyptic word "chalcolibanon (or -os)" are of great value as illustrations of the need of special investigation before accepting the existence of any rare word in a

<sup>1</sup> [522 (v) c] The bracketed words in Dan. were om. by Rev., partly, perhaps, because of obscurity in the Greek and the Hebrew texts of Daniel. "Beryl," תרשיש, is transliterated by Theod. as "Tharseis." It is uncertain whether LXX meant to transliterate it as "Thalasses," or to render it "of the sea" owing to a loose recollection of "ships of *Tarshish*." The LXX "mouth" is a Gk. corruption of "body" σώμα (written COMA) into CTOMA, paralleled in the LXX of Judg. xiv. 8.

[522 (v) d] But the last part of the bracketed passage in Daniel seems so free from obscurity as to suggest that it may have been omitted by Rev. from a doubt as to the applicability of "lightning" to the face of the Son of man. In any case, Rev. substitutes for the omitted clause one of about the same length from another passage of Daniel describing the "raiment" of the "ancient of days," (Dan. vii. 9) "*His raiment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool.*" Only, by dropping "raiment," Rev. applies to the "head and hair" the epithet "white," which was not meant for them in the Original.

[522 (v) e] Instead of "as the appearance of lightning," Swete quotes from Syr.<sup>mg</sup> a', i.e. Aquila, *ὡς χρυσολίθος [τοῦτεστι μαργαριτὸς ὁμοίος χρυσῷ]*, "as chrysolith [that is to say, a pearl like gold]." Now "chrysolith" represents the Heb. תרשיש "beryl" in the LXX of Exod. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13 and Ezek. xxviii. 13 (see Oxf. Concordance): and Aquila uses it for the same Heb. in Ezek. i. 16 (LXX θάψετς), x. 9 (LXX ἀνθρακος). It would seem, therefore, that Aquila must have given "like chrysolith" as the substitute for the LXX "like of the sea," and not for the lightning-clause. But it is possible that Aquila may have rejected the lightning-clause as a corruption (perhaps as conflating the beryl-clause): if so, there were additional reasons why Rev. should omit the words.

<sup>2</sup> "Brass." See 522 (vi).

document that bears signs of being, in parts, translated from Hebrew.

The word "chalcolibanon" is not alleged to exist in Greek literature anywhere except here and a little later on, where the phrase is repeated.<sup>1</sup> The grammarian Suidas negatively testifies to his ignorance of the word in the following note, "Chalcolibanon, a kind of electrum more precious than gold. Now electrum is . . ."; and he proceeds to tell us about electrum several details (among others, that it is of the same material as "the holy table of the great church"),<sup>2</sup> but about "chalcolibanon" nothing. Yet this is the only external evidence—worth calling evidence—to the existence of the word.

We pass to evidence of its being a corruption. The Hebrew for (Theod.) "flashing" and (LXX) "sends forth lightning"—which are severally parallel to the chalcolibanon-clause—is לִלְק. But this word means "to be light," and hence "make light of," "disparage," "curse." It occurs, however, once in connection with "brass," where Ezekiel says of the feet of the "living creatures" that (Ezek. i. 7) "they sparkled like the colour of brass *burnished* (לִלְק)." Not unnaturally, the LXX there, while rendering it "sending-forth-lightning" (ἐξαστράπτων), also conflates it as "agile," and connects it with the "wings" mentioned in the following verse. But it is explained as "glittering" in a Targum. Probably no one would dispute that this unique application of לִלְק to "brass" is borrowed from Ezekiel by Daniel. And, as it caused difficulty to the LXX in Ezekiel and to

<sup>1</sup> Rev. ii. 18 "These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet are like *chalcolibanon*."

<sup>2</sup> [522 (vi) a] Suidas, quoted by Wetst. on Rev. i. 15. It is hardly worth mentioning that Salmasius (Thayer) quotes "an ancient Greek [Ansonius]" (*sic*) as saying that "Frankincense (ὁ λίβανος) has three kinds of trees, and the male is called chalcolibanos, in appearance like the sun," except as an instance of the kind of testimony that is thought worth alleging in dealing with N.T.

<sup>3</sup> See Black, *Enc.*, "Brass."



the Targumist who thought an explanation needful, so may it have done to the author of the Apocalypse (or to the authorities whom he followed).

We must therefore be prepared to find in the Apocalyptic text confusion, and, of course, what almost always accompanies confusion of the worst kind—conflation. Now “chalcolibanon” is followed by (Rev. i. 15) “refined in a furnace (καμίνῳ),” and the Hebrew word mostly rendered by R.V. “oven,” but rendered “furnace” in Is. xxxi. 9 (“his (the Lord’s) furnace”) is regularly rendered by LXX “clibanos (κλίβανος).” Now “brass from (or, of) the furnace (clibanos)” might easily be corrupted, in Greek, into “brass from (or, of) libanos”; and an instance of a similar corruption occurs in Lev. ii. 4, “baked [in the] oven,” rendered by the LXX “cooked from libanos,” which LXX perhaps interpreted as “cooked with the aid of frankincense.”<sup>1</sup> So here, the original was probably “Brass in the furnace,” which has been conflated as “(a<sub>1</sub>) Chalcolibanon, (a<sub>2</sub>) as if refined in a furnace.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> LXX ἐκ λιβάνου, but F (in accordance with the Hebrew) ἐν κλίβανῳ.

<sup>2</sup> [522 (vi) δ] In Rev. i. 15, ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης (marg. -ένοι), the extraordinary feminine genitive can be explained on the above hypothesis, as follows. The Original had ὅμοιοι χάλκῳ ἐν κλίβανῳ, i.e. “brass [refined] in the furnace (or, oven).” This was amended in the margin by inserting “refined,” and by substituting the word “furnace” (i.e. κάμινος) for the word that means more usually “oven” (i.e. κλίβανος). But ἐν κλίβανῳ being written ἐκλιβανῳ was, as in Lev. ii. 4, corrupted into ἐκ λιβανου. Then λιβανου, being regarded possibly as “frankincense” (in which case it is feminine in classical Greek) was treated as a fem. noun with which πεπυρωμένης must agree. Yet subsequently the original χάλκῳ (written χαλκο, as υἷς=υἰῶ in Rev. i. 13) ἐν κλίβανῳ prevailed in the first part of the conflation in the form χαλκοεκλιβανῳ, corrupted first into χαλκοελιβανῳ, and then into χαλκολιβανῳ (by dropping ε after ο, a frequent error). Thus the conflation became inconsistent.

[522 (vi) ε] Another explanation (mentioned by Thayer with disapproval, but preferable to the recognition of chalcolibanon as a Greek word) regards λιβάνου as a transliteration of לבן, “whiten,” which is the root of “Lebanon,” the “white” mountain, as also of Libanos meaning “frankincense.” In New Hebrew, this word (Levy, ii. 468 (a)) is used of purifying metal utensils with glowing heat. It is therefore quite intelligible that such a word should be employed in a New Hebrew paraphrase of the almost unique לבן, “flashing,” and should be trans-



(a) (vii) *Inferences from the fore-going facts*

[522 (vii)] The immediately preceding paragraphs do not warrant the inference that this extremely rare use of the word קלל—peculiar to one passage in Ezekiel and to an imitation of it in Daniel—rendered above (522 (v)), severally, “flashing,” “send forth lightning,” and “Chalcolibanon,” is as likely as the familiar “lightning,” ברק, to be at the basis of the Transfiguration-narrative. It will be remembered also that the “metamorphosing” in the Transfiguration was shewn (420) to have a probable basis in the “putting-forth-horns” of glory mentioned in the transfiguration of Moses. Now “horn,” קרן, if preceded by the preposition ב (in such a phrase as “*with rays*,” “*when emitting rays*” etc.), would give, in its first three letters, בקר “dawn,” which we have shewn above to have been confused with “lightning”: and this rather confirms the view taken above as to the class of words accountable for the differences in the Synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration.

But the discussion of the passages in Daniel and the Apocalypse leads to the two following conclusions, which will be found of great value.

(1) A Christian Evangelist, describing such an event as the Transfiguration, would naturally adopt the language of O.T. describing similar events. This we infer from the fact that the author of the Apocalypse describes a vision of his own in language used by Daniel. *A fortiori*, an Evangelist who had not seen the Transfiguration would prefer to use Biblical language, where suitable, to describe it.

(2) Where the language of O.T. presented difficulties either in the Hebrew or in the Greek, or in both, an Evangelist—instead of adopting any version of it, or attempt-

literated by a Greek translator of Daniel. But, regard being had to the facts above alleged about the actual interchange of clibanos and libanos in the LXX, the explanation based on Greek corruption seems on the whole more probable.

ing a new version of his own—might break away from it altogether, substituting another passage, if possible, from the same source. This we infer from the Apocalyptic substitution of the clause about “hair like wool” in place of the clause about *tharseis* or *thalassés*.

The second of these conclusions suggests caution as to the inference drawn above that Mark’s curious tradition (“so as no fuller on earth”) was simply a corruption of the same Hebrew that produced “light” and (D) “snow” in Matthew. Possibly, since “a fuller” in the Rabbinical language may mean a cleanser from sin, and since the Rabbis played on the similarity of the words for “fuller” and the sacrificial “lamb”<sup>1</sup>—both being cleansers of sin—Mark may have adopted some old tradition about the garments of the Lord in the Transfiguration, as being pure beyond any purification that could be obtained by any “fuller on earth.” The Apocalypse describes the “garments of the saints” as washed in “the blood of the Lamb.” It is easy to imagine that highly metaphorical language—intelligible in the schools of Galilee but not to us—may have been used about the garments of the Lamb Himself. On the whole, however, the comparison (522 (iv) a) of the Mark-tradition with that of the Acts of John, makes it probable that Hebrew corruption has been at work in both.

(β) (i) *Variations in the account of the Resurrection ;*  
*“lightning,” why omitted by Mark?*

[523] We return to the passage describing the apparition at Christ’s tomb. The first point to be explained is the agreement of Matthew and Luke in the word “lightning,” omitted by Mark. That Luke did not borrow it

<sup>1</sup> Levy, ii. 288 (b). A rabbi quoting Numb. xxviii. 3 says, “Although the word sounds כבשים (lambs), yet we read it כבסים (fullers).” A story about “a fuller” was said to mean a story about Rabbi Akiba.

from Matthew is indicated by the fact that Matthew applies the word to the angel's "appearance" and not to his garment, which Matthew describes as "like *snow*." Using the key afforded above (522 (i)), we conclude that the Original may have contained, if not ברק "lightning," some word similar to it, and likely to be confused with it, as also with ברד "hail" or "snow." "Lightning" is applied by Luke to the angel's "garment": both "lightning" and "snow" are adopted by Matthew; and, as he could not very well say that the "garment" was like "snow and lightning," he introduces a distinction:—"the angel's appearance was like *lightning* and his garment was like *snow*."

(β) (ii) *Other variations*

[524] But why does Luke omit the word "white" and mention "two" where Mark has "one"? And why does Mark speak of a "young-man," and Luke of "men," where Matthew has (the apparently more appropriate) "angel"?

The first step towards answering these questions is to shew that the Hebrew for "young-man" is liable to be confused with the class of words above-mentioned ("lightning," "snow," "(morning) light"). "Young-man" is בחור (rendered by Mark's word νεανισκός, no less than thirty-seven times in the LXX); "morning light" is בקר; and the letters ח (*ch*) and ק (*k*), though not similar to read, are interchanged fairly often in transliterating names.<sup>1</sup> Now, owing to the confusion of these two letters, in Samuel's address to Israel about the evils of monarchy, "your . . . *young-men*" is rendered by the Septuagint "your *oxen*."<sup>2</sup> But the same Hebrew consonants mean both "morning-light" and "oxen." It follows that "young-man" and

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Oxf. Conc.*, Κέλεις and Κωθάν, where κ = η; Κεδουράν, Κειράμας, where κ = η; Καμείν, Κατάαθ, where κ = η transposed.

<sup>2</sup> 1 S. viii. 16 "your young-men (בְּחֹרִים)," τὰ βουκόλια ὑμῶν (leg. בקר for בחור).



"morning-light" might be similarly confused; and we are led to the conclusion that the Hebrew original contained a word belonging to the class mentioned above, that is to say, capable of being read as "lightning," "snow," "morning-light," "young-man."<sup>1</sup>

[525] Possibly confusion may have arisen from the use of a technical term to describe the clothing of the "young man" who proclaims the resurrection. Ezekiel and Daniel speak of men seen by them in visions, and doing the work of angels, as clothed in what R.V. calls "linen" but Gesenius more exactly calls "white linen" (בד), a white stuff used for priestly vestments.<sup>2</sup> But בד is easily confused with בר. The latter means "pure," but might be interpreted as "bright," and is indeed once rendered "far-shining." The former (בד) is also once confused with the word בחר meaning "chosen," or "young man."<sup>3</sup> Aquila—not however through confusion but for etymological reasons—repeatedly renders the plural of בד, "chosen out (ἐξαιρέτος)." Others transliterate it as (in the plural) *Baddein*, or render it "linen," or "long robe," or "raiment" (στολή, the word used here by Mark).<sup>4</sup> A word so similar to the class of words mentioned in the last paragraph would obviously add to the possibilities of confusion there mentioned. Again, the transposition of one letter converts ברק "lightning" into קבר "sepulchre"—a word inserted here by Mark but not in the parallel Matthew and Luke. And a final possible cause of confusion must not be omitted. The root of "young man"

<sup>1</sup> There is another word for "young man," נער; but that means "stripling," "lad," and sometimes "servant." It would be out of place here.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11, Dan. x. 5, xii. 6, 7 (see Gesen. Oxf., בר).

<sup>3</sup> [525a] Ps. xix. 8 "pure (ברה (fem.)), "τηλαυγής, "far-shining," possibly reading בהיר, which = τηλαυγής in Job xxxvii. 21; Ezek. xix. 14 ברה LXX τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτῆς (leg. בחור, an error facilitated by the feminine termination. The word here means not "linen," but "branches").

<sup>4</sup> [525b] Aquila renders "linen (ברים)" ἐξαιρέτος in 1 S. ii. 18, xxii. 18, 2 S. vi. 14, Ezek. ix. 2, etc., and Dan. x. 5. In Dan. x. 5, xii. 6, 7, Theod. has βαδδελν, LXX βύσσινα.



בָּהָר is very like בָּהָר, "bright-shining," a word that, though not common in the Bible except in derivative nouns, is used in New Hebrew as a verb.<sup>1</sup>

[526] In the passages just [525] referred to, Ezekiel and Daniel do not use the term "angel," but speak of "a man clothed in [white] linen." But the Apocalypse of St. John and the Book of Enoch associate white garments, or whiteness, with the angelic hosts, and with saints, and the Hebrew "man" often stands for "one," in a sense impermissible in Greek.<sup>2</sup> Hence it was natural that Matthew and John should substitute "angel(s)." Indeed, what is remarkable is that Luke retains "man." Possibly, Luke, finding some reading that allowed him to take the meaning as dual, and having regard to the proverb current in the Christian Church, "the testimony of two *men* is true," preferred to use "men" both here and in his account of the Ascension. If the original contained the word "young man," or "chosen," Matthew and others, rendering it by its frequent meaning

<sup>1</sup> [525c] Another word for "white (stuff)" is חור, applied to the garments of the Ancient of days in Dan. vii. 9 (lit.) "wearing, like snow, *white* (חור)" Theod. λευκόν, LXX prob. ἔχων (leg. היה). If we could suppose that "in white" was בָּהָר we should have letters identical with those for "young man." But "in (-ב)" is hardly ever used with verbs of clothing, the accusative being preferred. And חור occurs only in Dan. vii. 9, Esth. i. 6, viii. 15, Is. xix. 9, "those weaving *white-stuff*." In Gen. xl. 16 it is applied to "bread."

The regular Heb. for "white" is לבן: but this is not applied to garments except in Eccles. ix. 8, "Let thy garments be always *white* and let not thy head lack ointment," preceded by "drink thy wine with a merry heart." The festive context makes the word less likely to be used by an Evangelist concerning an angel. But it should be added that the verb "whiten" is used in Dan. xi. 35, xii. 10 meaning "purify."

<sup>2</sup> [526a] Book of Enoch (ed. Charles, p. 230) § 87 "Beings who were *like white men*," i.e. unfallen angels (comp. Dan. xi. 35, xii. 10): Rev. iii. 4, iv. 4, vii. 9, xix. 14. It must be admitted, however, that great difficulty attends the supposition of an original בָּהָר intended to mean "angel." The form בָּהָר is used of "the elect" of Jehovah in Is. xlii. 1, xliii. 20, etc.: and the same Greek word, ἁλεκτος, frequently renders both בָּהָר, "young man," and בָּהָר, "elect": but neither form in O.T. appears to be applied to angels. The complete discussion of this point, as also of the origin of Mk. xvi. 5 "on the right," and the reason why Lk. omits the description of the angel(s) as (Mk. Mt.) "sitting," must be reserved for a commentary on the Triple Tradition.

"elect," might take it as indicating one of the "elect (angels)." The word also sometimes means "mighty one."

[527] Our conclusion is that the Synoptic variations may be at all events partly explained as being conflateions, or mistranslations, of some word, or words, capable of meaning, with very slight changes, "morning-light," "sepulchre," "young-man," "lightning," "snow," "[white] linen." Which one of these words—or possibly which pair—constituted the Original, is a question too complex for discussion here.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [527a] It may, however, be pointed out that the context of Mk. contains indications of a tradition, conflated and inaccurate and hence not followed by Mt. or Lk., but shewing traces of extreme antiquity. For example, whereas Mt. and Lk. mention the rolling away of the stone only once (Mt. xxviii. 2, Lk. xxiv. 2), Mk. mentions it thrice, thus (Mk. xvi. 3, 4) "(a<sub>1</sub>) Who will roll away the stone . . . ? And having looked-up" [ἀναβλέψασαι, which in N.T. mostly means "having seen clearly," or "regained sight"] "they behold that (a<sub>2</sub>) the stone has been *rolled upward* (ἀνακεκλισται): for (a<sub>3</sub>) it was very great."

[527b] Why should the later Evangelists omit "for it was very great"? Turning to Ezra v. 8, we find "great stones" rendered by LXX in Ezra "elect stones," but in 1 Esdr. vi. 9 "polished, costly (ξυστῶν πολυτελῶν) stones." But the Hebrew is literally "stones of rolling (לְלִי)." It follows that in Mk. "it was *very great*" may be an erroneous repetition of "it was *rolled away*," or *vice-versa*. Or both may be erroneous attempts to translate an original that still awaits restoration. As for the question "Who will roll away?" instances have been given (490-1) to shew that the interrogative may be conflation, arising from a confusion of ך "who" with ך indicating a participle or preposition. In New Heb., לָלִי "roll" (Levy), even without "stone," means "a heavy stone," and לָלִי, lit. "rolled," means the larger grave-stone placed perpendicularly in the wall of a tomb, and kept in its place by a smaller stone. There are, therefore, manifest possibilities of confusion between "roll" and "grave-stone."

[527c] "Rolled *upward* (ἀνακεκλισται)," used in Mk.'s statement of fact, presents a difficulty that has induced Mt.-Lk. to substitute the easier word "roll *away* (ἀποκυλίω)," assigned by Mk. to the women: and D and SS substitute "roll away" in Mk. Swete renders ἀνακυλίω "rolled back." But (1) the word (non-occurrent in LXX) means "roll upward" in Lucian (vol. ii. 925, *De Luct.* 8), Dion. Hal. (*De Comp. Verb.* Reiske, vol. v. p. 139) and apparently Plut. ii. 304 τὰς ἀμάξας ἀνακυλίαντες (unless we should read *κατα-* for *ἀνα-*): (2) a perpendicular stone placed against a hole in a wall cannot well be "rolled *back*," but must either be "rolled *forward*" (after removing the smaller stone (Levy, 307b) which prevented this), or "rolled *away* (ἀποκυλίω)," or "lifted (or, taken) out of its place (*αἶρω*)" (comp. Jn. xx. 1). These two facts, combined with the rejection of the word by all later accounts (including Jn. xx. 1, Pseudopet. 9 and

§ 79. *The end of Mark's Gospel—"for they feared"*

Mk. xvi. 8.

Mt. xxviii. 8, 9.

Lk. xxiv. 9-11.

"And having come out they fled from the tomb: for trembling and amazement pos-

"And having come out quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy they ran to

"And having turned back [from the tomb] they *carried-word* of all these

Acta P.) indicate the difficulty of the word; but, far from disproving, they rather suggest, its originality. It may be a remnant of a Hebrew Gospel which regarded the stone as being "rolled upward" by a supernatural power, or else in a vision, so as to vanish from sight. Pseudopet. § 9 describes the stone as "rolled of itself," ἀφ' αὐτοῦ κυλισθεῖς.

[527*d*] The word "roll," גלל, may be easily confused with גלה, "reveal," and also with various forms of the root "round," which is latent in Gilgal, Golgotha, etc. In New Hebrew, Levy gives (i. 334 (b)) גלילין as meaning "turban," "head band," also spelt (i. 330 (b)) גלילין. Any of these words can easily be confused with גלל "grave-stone." And the similarity suggests that Jn. xx. 7 mentioning the "napkin about the head" as "rolled up in a place by itself," may be a variant of "the grave-stone rolled away."

[527*e*] A trace of mistranslation in the context appears in Mark's statement that Joseph "bought (ἀγοράσας)" linen (Mk. xv. 46), where Lk. xxiii. 53 omits "bought," and Mt. xxvii. 59 substitutes "pure." "*Fine linen*" is in New Hebrew (Levy i. 191 (b)) סוכחר בבר, i.e. "chosen among linen." But by very little more than transposition of the frequently confused (516*a*) *m* and *b*, "chosen" becomes "with a price," במסחר. Now to "take with a price" = "buy," and is rendered ἀγοράζω in 2 Chr. i. 16.

[527*f*] That the effect of mistranslation extends to Jn. is suggested by many details. One may be mentioned, because it bears on the passages quoted above (498*d* and *g*) shewing that "garden" in Jn. might be an error (Jn. xx. 15) "She, supposing that he was the *gardener*, says to him, Sir, if thou hast *conveyed*" [ἐβάστασας i.e. "stolen away," though perhaps as a friendly act, as in (R.V.) 2 K. xi. 2, 2 Chr. xxii. 11, where Joash is "stolen" to preserve his life, and see Field's note on Jn. xii. 6 ἐβάστασεν, probably "stole"] "him [hence], tell me where thou hast laid him." The word for "gardener" given by Delitzsch, and recognized by Levy, is גנן, but this when written גננ closely resembles "convey" גננ: and the latter makes excellent sense; "supposing that he was the *conveyer*, says to him, Sir if thou hast *conveyed* him."

[527*g*] But the most important indication of mistranslation is in the account of the women buying, or bringing (Mk. xvi. 1, Lk. xxiv. 1) "spices (ἀρώματα)" (Lk. xxiii. 56 adds "myrrh"), an act assigned by Jn. xix. 38-40 to Joseph and Nicodemus, but altogether omitted by Mt. Jn. describes "a roll (ἐλγυμα)" (v.r. μίγμα, "mixture") of myrrh and aloes "about a hundred pounds weight," intended (Westc.) "to cover the body completely with the mass of aromatics." Looking for an illustration in O.T., we find Is. xxv. 7 "And he will destroy in this



sessed them : and they said nothing to any (lit. no) one, for they feared (imperf.)."

*carry-word to his disciples. And behold Jesus met them . . .*"

things *to the* eleven and all the rest. Now it was Mary Magdalene and . . . And (lit.) there appeared before them as idle-dreams (λῆρος) these words, and they disbelieved (imperf.) them (*i.e.* the women)."

mountain the face of *the covering* הָלוּם (lit.) *that is covered* (הָלוּם) over all the peoples, and *the veil* הַסֶּכֶה (lit.) *that is veiled* (הַסֶּכֶה) over all the nations." Here the LXX, which utterly confuses the passage, has "They will anoint themselves with *myrrh* (μύρρον) in this mountain . . .," apparently taking לוֹם "covering" as מֵל, which means "myrrh" in Gen. xxxvii. 25, xliii. 11 (στακτή).

[527½] St. Paul says of the Jews (2 Cor. iii. 15) "Unto this day, whensoever Moses is read, *a veil* lieth upon their heart, but whensoever it shall turn to the Lord *the veil* is taken away"; Lk. says of the disciples to whom Christ predicted His Resurrection, (Lk. ix. 45) "it was *veiled* (παρεκαλυμμένον) from them"; and Jn. implies a "veiling" of the Scriptures from the disciples, when he says concerning Peter and John, immediately after the Resurrection, (Jn. xx. 9) "For as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise from the dead." It is therefore not antecedently improbable that a very early Jewish Evangelist, wishing to describe the condition of the disciples immediately after Christ's death, might use the language of Isaiah "A *covering* (לוֹם) was *covered* over them and a *veil* (סֶכֶה) was *veiled*."

[527i] But, if "covering" was rendered by Greek translators "myrrh," it would naturally lead to a misinterpretation of "veil (סֶכֶה)." For "veil" is from the root נָסַךְ, which means "pour out," "melt," "fuse," far more often than it means "weave": and in one of the three instances in which סֶכֶה occurs, R.V. has (Is. xxx. 1) (txt.) "*cover with a covering*," but marg. "*weave a web*," or "*pour out a drink-offering*," or, "make a league." Assuming therefore that "covering covering" meant "myrrh myrrh," Greeks might infer that "covering" meant "liquid perfume" or ointment of some kind. This would lead to marginal suggestions, such as we find in Jn. who combines "roll" (or "covering") with "myrrh" and "aloes."

[527j] This hypothesis would explain some curious variations. For example, D, in Lk. xxiv. 1, omits "spices": SS substitutes "*other women came with them*." Pseudopeter has "*Mary Magdalene . . . having taken with herself her friends*," no mention being made of spices in any part of the narrative. This could be explained either by Hebrew or by Greek corruption as a variant of "aloes," אֶהְלוֹם. So rare a word (twice out of four times mistranslated by the LXX owing to its identity with אֶהָל, "tent") might easily be confused with אֶהְרִימֹה, the fem. of "others," and translated "other women." This is more prob-



[528] The explanation of these extraordinary variations is based on two common phenomena in the Septuagint: (i) the omission of the Hebrew negative, (ii) the confusion of the Hebrew verb "fear" with the Hebrew verb meaning in the active "see," in the passive, "appear."

(i) (*Mk.*) "*they said nothing*," (*Mt.*) "*to carry word*,"  
(*Lk.*) "*carried word*"

[529] The Hebrew negative in its most common form is very frequently confused with (*a*) "to him," with (*b*) "God," with (*c*) "to," and with (*d*) "or." Also, (*e*) when it precedes words beginning with נ, the final נ of "not" is apt to be dropped. The remaining letter is the regular sign of the infinitive.<sup>1</sup>

In the present passage of Mark, "they did not say" might be an instance falling under (*e*), and there would be

able than that αλωθ, "aloes," should be confused with αλλω, "others" (though ἄλλος is confused with (Mal. ii. 15) καλός, and with (1 Esdr. viii. 20 (A), parall. to Est. vii. 22) ἄλας.

[527<sup>k</sup>] As regards Jn.'s amplification "a hundred pounds," it cannot be considered improbable that, out of the reduplicated "lût," לוֹט, there should spring a variant "litra," לִטְרָה (used in New Heb.) i.e. "pound." Again, Mk. had said that Joseph had "bought" the linen and that the women had "bought" the spices. Now the opposite of "buying" would be "taking out of one's own store," or, as the Hebrew idiom goes, "from himself" (as opposed to "taking at a price"). Hence, if an editor wished to contradict Mk., he might write in the margin "from himself," מִנֶּחֱמִי. But this is easily confused with מֵמֵט "a hundred."

[527<sup>l</sup>] These suggestions are put forth, in the belief, not that all of them are probable, but that, taken cumulatively, they constitute a considerable probability that the variations between the Evangelists arise, not from "editorial freedom"—a euphemism for "exaggeration"—nor yet from the use of later authentic information by the Evangelists, but from mistranslation. The facts appear to point to a vision seen by the women when the "veil" and the "covering" were taken from off them, and they "looked up" (or, "regained their sight") and the stone was "rolled up" to heaven.

<sup>1</sup> "Not" = אֵין, sometimes written לוֹ: (*a*) "to him" = לוֹ: (*b*) "God" = אֵל: (*c*) "to" = אֵל: (*d*) "or" = אֵל: (*e*) אֵין "not," preceding אָמַר "speak," would be in danger of being written אָמַר לוֹ, i.e. "to speak" or "speaking."

a danger of its being corrupted into "for the purpose of saying," or "saying."<sup>1</sup>

(ii) *Consequences of the Omission of the Negative*

[530] Hebrew frequently expresses "not . . . any" by "not every." Thus, in Jeremiah, "let us not give heed to any of his words" is, literally, "let us not (לֹא) give heed to *all* his words." But this happens to be one of the numerous passages where the Septuagint omits the negative. Consequently the Greek has "and we *will give* heed to (lit. listen to) *all* his words."<sup>2</sup>

Now let us suppose that a similar mistranslation took place in the case of Mark's Original, "And they said nothing to any one," Heb. "And they said *not* to *every one* a word." The omission of the negative would reduce this to "they said to *every one* a word." Then it would become necessary for such Evangelists as accepted the omission to explain, severally, "every one" as meaning—not, of course, all the world, but—(a) "his disciples," or (b) "the eleven," or (c) "all the rest." Others might read (d) "every word" instead of "every one a word." Matthew has adopted (a). Luke has conflated (b), (c), and (d).

[531] When the negative was dropped from the phrase

<sup>1</sup> [529a] Instances of the omission of the negative are far too frequent for complete enumeration. The following bear specially on the interchange of "not" and "to": Prov. xii. 28 "*no death*" εἰς θάνατον, Is. v. 7 "*for* (-ῃ) righteousness" οὐ δικαιοσύνην, Prov. xxvii. 19 "*face to* (-ῃ) face . . . man *to* (-ῃ) man" οὐχ . . . οὐδὲ . . . , Ezek. xiii. 5 "*to* (-ῃ) stand," οὐκ ἀνέστησαν, 1 K. xi. 10 "and he kept *not* (ἡ) " καὶ φυλάξασθαι.

[529b] Instances of confusion owing to the contiguity of *κ* or *λ*, are Judg. i. 18 "and he took (וָלָק)" καὶ οὐκ ἐκληρονόμησεν (leg. κλ. ἡλ), 2 S. xiv. 32 "let me see (וָלַק)" οὐκ εἶδον (leg. ἡλ κλ), Zech. xiii. 4 "neither shall they wear (וָלַק)" καὶ ἐνδύσονται (leg. ἡλ κλ), Dan. x. 9 "yet heard I (וָלַק)," LXX καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσα.

There are cases, but comparatively few, of οὐ ins. or om. after -ου, or confused with σν by Gk. corruption.

<sup>2</sup> Jerem. xviii. 18, "and let us *not* give heed to *any* of his words" καὶ [Q. marg. ins. οὐκ] ἀκουσόμεθα πάντα τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ.

"they said *not* a word," it would be necessary to adopt a stronger word than "say," in order to denote the bringing of the glad tidings. The Mark-Appendix twice uses the word "report," "carry-word," of Mary Magdalene and others, carrying the tidings of the Resurrection; and the parallel Matthew assigns it to Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Matthew and Luke here, deviating from Mark, adopted "carry-word" as being in general use in Greek traditions to describe the first announcement of the Resurrection.

[532] (iii) (*Mk.*) "*for<sup>2</sup> they feared,*" (*Mt.*) "*and beho'd Jesus,*" (*Lk.*) "*and there appeared before them . . . disbelieved them*"

[533] The instances of the confusion between "fear" and "see," "behold," or "appear," are too numerous to quote in full, but some are given below.<sup>3</sup> In some forms the two are identical, *e.g.* נִרְאֶה means either "he feared" or "he will see." It is obvious that when Mark's preceding words "they said nothing" had been altered into "they told everything" there would be a strong inducement to convert the now unintelligible phrase about "fearing" into one about "beholding" or "appearing." And the abrupt termination of Mark's Gospel at this point would leave

<sup>1</sup> *Mk.* xvi. 10, 13, *Mt.* xxviii. 10 ἀπαγγέλλειν, *Jn.* xx. 18 has ἀγγέλλειν. For an instance of the apparent substitution of this word for an original "say," comp. *Mk.* iii. 32 καὶ λέγουσιν, [*Mt.* xii. 47 εἶπεν δέ τις], *Lk.* viii. 20 ἀπηγγέλη δέ.

<sup>2</sup> [532a] *Mk.*'s "for (γάρ)" may represent an original Hebrew "and (-)." Comp. *Judg.* xxi. 18 "Howbeit (-)," LXX ὅτι, *i.e.* "because" or "for" (A καὶ), 1 *K.* xxii. 37 "so (lit. and) (-) the king died," ὅτι.

<sup>3</sup> [533a] "Fear" = φοβέσθαι, "see" = ὁρᾶν. Comp. *Job* xxxvii. 24 "he regardeth them not," LXX "they shall fear him"; *Mic.* vi. 9 "will see (some ancient versions have fear) thy name," LXX "fearing his name"; *Jer.* xvii. 8 "he shall not fear (v.r. see)," LXX "fear"; *Jud.* xiv. 11 "when they saw him," so LXX, but A reads "when they feared him"; *Eccles.* xii. 5 "shall be afraid of," LXX "shall see." For other instances see 2 *S.* xiv. 15, 2 *Chr.* xxvi. 5, *Prov.* xxix. 16, *Is.* xvi. 12, *Ezek.* i. 18, xviii. 14, etc. In *Hab.* iii. 2, "fear" is conflated as "see"; in 2 *S.* xxii. 16, *Heb.* and LXX "appeared" (ὡφθησαν), *Luc.* has "they feared."



subsequent Evangelists free to accept any additions explaining the nature of the "beholding" or "appearing," so as to prepare the way for the supplementary traditions that they severally desired to append.<sup>1</sup>

### § 80. *Minor agreements of Matthew and Luke*

If these are to be fully examined they must be studied in detail with the aid of the Appendix. Only their general nature, and the inferences derivable from them, can be stated here. They are, almost entirely, just such modifications of Mark's text as might be expected from a Corrector desirous of improving style and removing obscurities.

[534] (i) In about twelve instances Matthew and Luke adopt corrections defining subject or object. For example, where Mark omits the subject (leaving it to be understood as "they," "people," etc.) Matthew and Luke supply "the disciples," etc. Again, where Mark omits an object, they insert it, aiming at greater definiteness in this and other ways, *e.g.* altering "coming" into "approaching," "the saying" into "this saying," "thence" into "from that city," etc.

(ii) In about fifteen instances they correct in Mark the abrupt construction caused by the absence of a connecting word. Where speech is introduced by a verb other than "say," the connecting word may be a participle: *e.g.* "questioned him, 'Art thou . . . ?'" is altered to "questioned him, *saying* 'Art thou . . . ?'" or "cried" to "said," or to "called aloud *saying*." This may fall under viii (541).

(iii) In about thirteen instances they correct Mark's

<sup>1</sup> As regards Mt. xxviii. 9 *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, it has been pointed out (456) that *ἰδοὺ* "behold!" appears often interchangeable, through Greek corruption, with *ἰδόν* "they saw." Some process of this kind would be necessary to explain the derivation of Mt.'s "and behold" from Mk.'s "for they feared." For the Heb. "behold (וַיַּרְא)!" is quite different from the Heb. "fear (וַיִּירָא)."



historic present. This number does not include the corrections of Mark's use of "says" applied to Jesus (see (v)).

(iv) In about twelve instances they substitute the participle (e.g. "saying") for the indicative with "and" (e.g. "and he says"), or for the relative and the subjunctive, e.g. "whosoever has," which is changed to "those having," etc.

[535] (v) In about twenty-three instances they substitute for Mark's "says (λέγει)" the word "said (εἶπεν)," or correct Mark's imperfect "used to say" or "began to say" (ἔλεγεν, more rarely ἤρξατο λέγειν).<sup>1</sup>

In the Septuagint this last form is almost confined to "singing" and "repeating." Both ἔλεγεν and λέγει would do very well in a little book of Short Sayings, such as the *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, or the recently-discovered Oxyrhynchian *Logia of Jesus*. Indeed, in the latter, "saith Jesus" is the regular termination (or introduction) to each Logion. For its use there, it might be urged that the present tense represented Jesus as one who, though dead "still speaketh" in abiding precepts. But in a connected history of Jesus—including dialogue and controversy as well as precept—the present tense would probably be considered—at least when men of education began to enter the Christian Church—somewhat below the level of Evangelic style (like our vernacular "says he"). The regular form in the Septuagint is the past tense, and that would probably weigh with such Evangelists as aspired to write as historians—though not with John.

[536] (vi) In at least thirty instances Matthew and

<sup>1</sup> [535a] The correction of the imperfect extends to other verbs; e.g. Mk. has, about fifteen times, "he (or, they) *began-to-question* (ἐπηρώτα, or, -ων)": the parallel Mt.-Lk. mostly have the aorist, or present, of some other verb of speech (456 (ii)), but, in any case, they never jointly agree in the imperf. of ἐπερωτᾶν. Akin to this, is Mk.'s (very frequent) superfluous use of the Greek verb "begin (ἀρχεσθαι)," as in Mk. vi. 7 "He *began* to send them out two by two." In the course of some five and twenty instances in Mk., this verb is never retained by Mt.-Lk., jointly, except in Mk. xiv. 19.

Luke agree in adopting the idiomatic Greek connecting particle (δέ)—commonly and necessarily (though most inadequately) rendered by the English “but”—instead of the literal translation of the Hebrew “and,” *i.e.* καί.

It is a mistake—though a very natural one—to infer that the prevalence of δέ, in the Gospels, indicates a Greek original, and that the prevalence of καί indicates a Hebrew one. A more probable inference would be that in some cases δέ indicates free translation, and καί literal translation, from Hebrew. But this may not always be the case. A Corrector, while altering the Hebraic “and” to the Hellenic “but,” may *in other respects* be more faithful to the sense of the original Hebrew.

[537] There are some very remarkable facts bearing on the Septuagint use of the Greek particles, “and” and “but.” The Hebraic particle, “and (καί),” is preferred in the graver or more ecclesiastical books, and the Greek particle, “but (δέ),” in more secular ones. For example, in the short book of Ruth, “but (δέ)” occurs twenty-nine times, but not once in the second book of Chronicles. Theodotion’s version of Daniel, which is certainly later than that of the Septuagint, frequently changes the Hellenic δέ into the Hebraic καί. So, too, the Septuagint version of Ezra—which is probably later, and is certainly closer to the Hebrew, than the Hellenic version called the First Book of Esdras—discards the Greek “but” and returns to the Hebraic “and.”

[538] So far, the facts are interesting but not unexpected: but it is surprising to find *a sudden and complete change in the use of these particles at a definite point in the Pentateuch*. A reference to the uses of the extremely common phrases “and (or, but) he said,” “and (or, but) it came to pass” in the Oxford Concordance, reveals that—whereas in Genesis and the greater part of Exodus the translators use both the Greek particle and the Hebraic with considerable frequency, and sometimes the former

almost as often as the latter—"but it came to pass" is discontinued from Exod. xix. 16 and "but he said" from Exod. xx. 22, *to the end of the historical books*.<sup>1</sup> Now, of these two passages, the first describes the thunders of the Law, and the second introduces the Law itself. Considering that, in a small portion of the Pentateuch, these phrases occur some hundreds of times, up to the point where they absolutely cease, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that, from the point where the Law was introduced, the Translators (or possibly Revisers) felt that a different style of translation, more literal and faithful to each "jot and tittle" of the sacred text, became incumbent on them.

[539] In any case, the phenomena of the Septuagint make it highly improbable that the agreement of Matthew and Luke on this point (the correction of "and" to "but") is accidental. And it is still more improbable that Luke repeatedly borrowed from Matthew, or Matthew from Luke, a detail of so minute a character, without borrowing at the same time something more important from the context. The facts point to the conclusion that Matthew and Luke—whether they originated the correction or borrowed it—substituted the Hellenic for the Hebraic particle independently of each other.

[540] (vii) Another class of corrections includes improvement of Greek construction or style, by softening abruptness, of a different kind from that mentioned above (534 (ii)), changing interrogatives into statements, introducing μέν . . . δέ, ἀλλά, or other particles, and altering Hebraic or vernacular words or phrases. In a few instances the correction may be made in the interests of seemliness, rather than of style, *e.g.* in Mk. ix. 6, where "frightened-out [of themselves]" is variously altered by Matthew and Luke.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These remarks relate to εἶπεν δέ, and καὶ εἶπεν, not to the use of ὁ δέ, "but he," with εἶπεν.

<sup>2</sup> See note on Mk. ix. 6 in Appendix.

[541] (viii) In some cases, and notably in the use of the exclamatory "behold," Matthew and Luke appear to agree in returning to a Hebrew Original. Important instances of this are given in the preceding pages. A few unimportant instances are marked as belonging to class viii in the Appendix.



## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX I

### A COMPLETE TABLE OF THE CORRECTIONS IN GREEK

[542] THE following pages exhibit, in Mark's order, the Greek textual agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, in the Triple Tradition.

Of these, the most important are explained, in Mark's order, in the preceding pages. These are marked (†).

Of the rest, a few are explained by footnotes ; but most belong to the eight classes mentioned in 534-41, and the class is indicated by a Roman number. The number 455 reminds the reader that Mark never uses *ἰδοὺ* in narrative.

[543] Some passages printed in Mr. Rushbrooke's Synopticon as agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark are not included below, *e.g.* the precepts about "saluting," "shoes," "the labourer," etc., in the Sending of the Twelve. Luke, though he has these, does not place them in the Sending of the Twelve, but in the Sending of the Seventy. These and other similar passages—printed in the Synopticon along with the Triple Tradition, not as being part of it but as throwing light on it—will be discussed in a subsequent treatise under the head of the Double Tradition.

[544] In a very few cases the text of Westcott and Hort deviates from that of Mr. Rushbrooke—especially in the earlier chapters printed before that text was placed at his disposal by the kindness of the Editors. For example, in Mk. ii. 9 they read *περιπάτει* (not *ὑπάγε*) agreeing with Mt.-Lk. In such cases, the text of Westcott and Hort is followed. And as a rule (unless the contrary is expressed), the later text of Westcott and Hort is adopted instead of the earlier, where the two differ.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
i. 5 <i>πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα</i> (†)	iii. 5 <i>πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰερδάνου</i>	iii. 3 <i>εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰερδάνου</i>

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
i. 7, 8 ἔρχεται . . . ὀπίσω [μου] . . . ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς . . . αὐτοὺς δὲ βαπτίσει (vii)	iii. 11 ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίξω . . . ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος	iii. 16 ἐγὼ μὲν . . . βαπτίξω ὑμᾶς, ἔρχεται δὲ . . .
i. 8 . . . πνεύματι ἀγίῳ (†)	iii. 11 ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ	iii. 16 ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ
i. 9, 10 . . . καὶ ἐβαπ- τίσθη . . . εἶδεν σχιζομέ- νους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς <sup>1</sup> (†)	iii. 13-16 . . . τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι (?) ὑπ' αὐτοῦ . . . βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . ἠνεψύχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί	iii. 21 . . . ἐν τῷ βαπ- τισθῆναι (?) ἀπάντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέν- τος . . . ἀνιψχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν
i. 10 τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν (vii)	iii. 16 πνεῦμα θεοῦ κατα- βαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν	iii. 22 καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν
i. 12 καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει (†) (also iii)	iv. 1 τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνῆχθη . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος	iv. 1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ . . . ὑπέστρεψεν, καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι
i. 13 . . . πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ (†)	iv. 1 πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου	iv. 2 πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου
i. 13 καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων (†)	iv. 2 ὑστερον ἐπείνασεν	iv. 2 συντελεσθεῖσών αὐτῶν ἐπείνασεν
i. 16 καὶ παράγων παρὰ (vi)	iv. 18 περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ . . .	v. 1 ἐγένετο δὲ . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ . . .
i. 16 εἶδεν Σ. καὶ Ἀ. τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σ. (†)	iv. 18 εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς Σ. . . . καὶ Ἀ.	v. 2 . . . καὶ εἶδεν δύο πλοῖα . . .
i. 38, 39 εἰς τὰ ἐχομένας κωμοπολεῖς, ἵνα κάκεῖ κη- ρύξῃ· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον. καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς . . . (†)	iv. 23 διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, . . .	iv. 43, 44 καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελισασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστά- λην. καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς . . .
i. 40 καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρός (iii and 455) <sup>2</sup>	viii. 2 καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν . . .	v. 12 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας.
i. 40 λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς (†)	viii. 2 λέγων Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς	v. 12 λέγων Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς
i. 41 ἤψατο καὶ λέγει (iv)	viii. 3 ἤψατο . . . λέγων,	v. 13 ἤψατο . . . λέγων
ii. 3 καὶ ἔρχονται φέρον- τες πρὸς αὐτόν . . . αἰρό- μενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων (†) (also iii and 455)	ix. 2 καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον αὐτῷ . . . ἐπὶ κλίνῃς βεβλημένον	v. 18 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνῃς . . .
ii. 5 καὶ ἰδὼν . . . λέγει (v)	ix. 2 καὶ ἰδὼν . . . εἶπεν	v. 20 καὶ ἰδὼν . . . εἶπεν

<sup>1</sup> Mk. i. 9, 10. In the parall. Mt.-Lk., *Synopticon* prints the first "baptize" (with a ? in Lk.) as an agreement of Mt.-Lk. But this arrangement is not adopted here as the verb refers in Mt. to Jesus, but in Lk. to the multitude.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. i. 40. Mk. (455) never uses ἰδοὺ in narrative.



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
ii. 6 δὲ . . . καὶ <sup>1</sup>	ix. 3 καὶ ἰδοὺ	v. 21 καὶ
ii. 8 λέγει [αὐτοῖς] (v)	ix. 4 εἶπεν,	v. 22 ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
ii. 11 τὸν κράβαττον σου (vii) <sup>2</sup>	ix. 6 σου τὴν κλίνην	v. 24 τὸ κλινιδίον σου
ii. 12 ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (†)	ix. 7 (and Lk. v. 26) ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (N.B.—In Lk. v. 25, there occurs ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν)	
ii. 12 ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας (†)	ix. 8 οἱ δὲ χλοὶ ἐφοβήθησαν	v. 26 . . . ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας . . . καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου
ii. 16 οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων <sup>3</sup>	ix. 11 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	v. 30 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν
ii. 16 οὗτοι ; (†)	ix. 11 διὰ τί ;	v. 30 διὰ τί ;
ii. 17 λέγει (v)	ix. 12 εἶπεν	v. 31 εἶπεν
ii. 18 καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ <sup>4</sup>	ix. 14 τότε προσέρχον- ται αὐτῷ . . . λέγοντες	v. 33 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν
ii. 21 ἐπιράπτει (†)	ix. 16 ἐπιβάλλει	v. 36 ἐπιβάλλει
ii. 22 εἰ δὲ μή (†)	ix. 17 εἰ δὲ μήγε	v. 37 εἰ δὲ μήγε
ii. 22 καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλ- λυνται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί. [ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς και- νοὺς] (†)	ix. 17 καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχε- ται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί ἀπόλυν- ται. ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς	v. 37 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθί- σεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί ἀπο- λύνται v. 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον
ii. 23 ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλαντες (†)	xii. 1 ἤρξαντο τίλλειν . . . καὶ ἐσθλείν	vi. 1 ἔτιλλον . . . καὶ ἥσθιον
ii. 24 καὶ οἱ Φ. ἔλεγον (v and vi)	xii. 2 οἱ δὲ Φ. ἰδόντες εἶπαν	vi. 2 τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φ. εἶπαν
ii. 25 λέγει (v)	xii. 3 εἶπεν	vi. 3 εἶπεν
ii. 26 εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεῖς (†)	xii. 4 εἰ μή τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις	vi. 4 εἰ μή μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς
iii. 1 εἰς συναγωγὴν (vii)	xii. 9 εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν	vi. 6 εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
iii. 4 καὶ λέγει (v and vi)	xii. 11 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	vi. 9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησ.
iii. 10 πολλοὺς . . . ἔθε- ράπευσεν . . .	xii. 15 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐθερά- πευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας <sup>5</sup>	vi. 19 πᾶς ὁ δὲ χλος ἐξή- τειν . . . ὅτι . . . ἰατο πάντας <sup>5</sup>
. . . ὅσοι εἶχον μᾶστιγας . . . (†) <sup>5</sup>	iv. 24 κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις	vi. 17 καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν

<sup>1</sup> Mk. ii. 6. It is doubtful whether Mt.-Lk. are here agreeing against Mk. (see context).

<sup>2</sup> Mk. ii. 11. Phrynichus condemns Mk.'s word: σκιμπούς λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ κράββατος (sic).

<sup>3</sup> Mk. ii. 16. Mt. does not agree here with Lk. except that by omitting οἱ γραμματεῖς he is forced to take Φαρ. as nominative.

<sup>4</sup> Mk. ii. 18. καὶ is corrected to (Mt.) τότε, (Lk.) δὲ: the historic present to (Lk.) the past: the indicative to (Mt.) the participle. Mt.-Lk. do not agree in any of these corrections, but merely in the casual use of πρὸς.

<sup>5</sup> Mk. iii. 10. As Mt. contains two distinct passages, the parallelism is uncertain. It is so very frequently inserted or omitted by the LXX where the Heb. severally omits or inserts it that this agreement of Matthew and Luke does not require detailed comment, espe-

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
iii. 18 καὶ Ἀνδρέαν (†)	x. 2 καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ	vi. 14 καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ
iii. 19-21 καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μὴδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν. ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη (see 363a)	xii. 22, 23 τότε προσ- ῆνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενον, τυφλὸν καὶ κωφόν· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες, οἱ ὄχλοι, καὶ ἔλεγον . . .	xi. 14 καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαίμονιον κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.
	Compare also :—	
	ix. 32, 33 αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων, ἰδοὺ προσ- ῆνεγκαν αὐτῷ κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον. καὶ ἐκβλή- θέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλά- λησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύ- μασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες . . .	
iii. 22 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερ. καταβάντες ἔλεγον (v and vi)	xii. 24 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον	xi. 15 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπαν
iii. 23-26 καὶ προσ- καλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς . . . ; καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεῖα ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι· ἡ βασιλεῖα ἐκείνη· καὶ ἐὰν οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη στήναι· καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς . . . (†) (also v and vi) (see 363b)	xii. 25, 26 εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πᾶσα βασιλεῖα μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἡ ἀποκρίνεται, καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθῆσεται. καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς . . .	xi. 17, 18 αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πᾶσα βασιλεῖα ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἡρη- μοῦται. εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατα- νᾶς . . .
iii. 27 . . . τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει <sup>1</sup>	xii. 29 . . . τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει	xi. 22 . . . τὰ σκῦλα αὐ- τοῦ διαδίδωσιν
	xiii. 30 (also Lk. xi. 23) ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ . . . σκορ- πίξει.	
iii. 28, 29 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,	xii. 31, 32 διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πᾶσα ἁμαρτία . . . ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀν-	xii. 10 καὶ πᾶς θς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀν- θρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

ally as "all" or "the multitude" may have been meant by the original of Mark's "many," which perhaps was "the many." *Synopticon* does not print πᾶς as an agreement.

In the contexts, Mt.-Lk. have ὄχλοι or ὄχλος where Mk. has merely διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. But this can hardly be called agreement against Mk., see contexts.

<sup>1</sup> Mk. iii. 27 διαρπάσει. After this word Mt.-Lk. insert "He that is not with me . . . scattereth." This may be from the Double Tradition, extracts from which are inserted in the preceding context (Mt. xii. 27, 28, Lk. xi. 19, 20). Or it may have been omitted in Mk. by Hebrew Homoioteleuton, since the same word (e.g. 113) might mean διαρπάζειν or σκορπίζειν.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
. . . ὅς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν (†)	θρώποις, . . . καὶ ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ	τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται
iii. 32 . . . καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ . . . ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε <sup>1</sup>	xii. 47 W.H. only in marg. [εἶπεν δὲ τις αὐτῷ . . . ἔξω ἐστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλήσαι]	viii. 20 ἀπηγγέλη δὲ αὐτῷ . . . ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε
iii. 33 καὶ . . . λέγει (v and vi)	xii. 48 (and Lk. viii. 21) ὁ δὲ . . . εἶπεν . . .	
iv. 1 ὄχλος πλείστος (vii)	xiii. 2 ὄχλοι πολλοί	viii. 4 ὄχλου πολλοῦ :
iv. 3 σπεῖραι (vii)	xiii. 3 τοῦ σπεῖρειν	viii. 5 τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπῆρον αὐτοῦ
iv. 4 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπεῖρειν (i)	xiii. 4 (and Lk. viii. 5) ἐν τῷ σπεῖρειν αὐτόν	
iv. 9 ὅς ἔχει ὦτα (iv)	xiii. 9 (and Lk. viii. 8) ὁ ἔχων ὦτα	
iv. 10 οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα (†)	xiii. 10 οἱ μαθηταί	viii. 9 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
iv. 11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ (v, vi, vii)	xiii. 11 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ὅτι Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν	viii. 10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ
iv. 15 αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτοὺς (†)	xiii. 19 ἀρπάξει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ	viii. 12 αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν
iv. 16 καὶ οὗτοι ὁμοίως εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη (vi)	xiii. 20 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη . . . οὕτως ἐστίν . . .	viii. 13 οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας . . . καὶ οὗτοι
iv. 18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας (vi)	xiii. 22 ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας	viii. 14 τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας . . .
iv. 20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες (vi)	xiii. 23 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρεῖς, οὕτως <sup>2</sup> ἐστίν . . .	viii. 15 τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοι <sup>2</sup> εἰσιν . . .
iv. 21 μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλινήν, οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ (MSS. ὑπό) τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ (†) (vii)	v. 15 οὐδὲ καλοῦσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν,	viii. 16 οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθῃσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθῃσιν,
		Compare—
		xi. 33 οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθῃσιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν

<sup>1</sup> Mk. iii. 32. W. and H. bracket the passage, bracketed above in Mt. SS omits it. Mk. iii. 31 has ἔξω στήκοντες, and Mt. xii. 46 ἐστήκεισαν ἔξω.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. iv. 20. For the insertion of (Mt.-Lk.) οὕτως, comp. Mk. xv. 43, Mt. xxvii. 58, Lk. xxiii. 50: it emphasizes the subject.



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
iv. 22 οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν [marg. ins. τι] κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ, οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν <sup>1</sup> (†)	x. 26 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον δ' οὐκ ἀπο- καλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν δ' οὐ γνωσθήσεται	viii. 17 οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν δ' οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον δ' οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ  Compare— xii. 2 οὐδὲν δὲ σιγῆκα- λυμμένον ἔστιν δ' οὐκ ἀπο- καλυφθήσεται καὶ κριπ- τὸν δ' οὐ γνωσθήσεται  xiii. 35 ὁ ἔχων
iv. 23 εἴ τις ἔχει (iv)	xi. 15 ὁ ἔχων	xiii. 35 ὁ ἔχων
iv. 30-32 καὶ ἔλεγεν, Πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασι- λείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θώμεν; ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότε- ρον ὢν πάντων τῶν σπερμά- των τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς—καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει, καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων, καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατα- σκηνοῦν (†) (also vii)	xiii. 31, 32 ἄλλην παρα- βολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ὅμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὃν λαβὼν ἄν- θρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ· δ' μικ- ρότερον μὲν ἔστιν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ αὔξηθῇ, μείζον τῶν λαχά- νων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλά- δοις (?) αὐτοῦ	xii. 18, 19 ἔλεγεν οὖν, Τίμι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τίμι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν; ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὃν λαβὼν ἄν- θρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἐαυτοῦ, καὶ ᾗξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατε- σκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις (?) αὐτοῦ
iv. 36 ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ (†) (also iii)	viii. 23 . . . ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον, ἡκολού- θησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	viii. 22 . . . αὐτοὶ ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
iv. 38 καὶ ἐγείρουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ (†) (also iii and iv)	viii. 25 καὶ προσελθόν- τες ἡγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες	viii. 24 προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέ- γοντες
iv. 41 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, . . . καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούει (†) (also iv, vi, and vii)	viii. 27 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες, . . . καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν	viii. 25 φοβηθέντες δὲ θαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, . . . καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ
v. 2-13 ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ . . . καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν . . . καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν . . .	viii. 28-32 δύο δαι- μονιζόμενοι . . . οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν (?) αὐτὸν . . . οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες	viii. 27-33 ἀνὴρ τις . . . ἔχων δαιμόνια . . . καὶ παρακάλουν (?) αὐτὸν . . . καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν

<sup>1</sup> Mk iv. 22 φανερόν. The Double Tradition has γνωσθήσεται. Luke, in the Triple Tradition, has conflated the two. Comp. Dan. iii. 18 "Be it known (γνωγνῆναι), LXX φανερόν, Theod. γνωστόν. If the original was γνωγνῆναι, Mark (like LXX in Dan.) was less literal than the later Evangelists.



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα (vi, vii, and see footnote on Mk. vi. 7)		. . . ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια . . .
v. 14 καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες (vi)	viii. 33 οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες	viii. 34 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες
v. 14 ἦλθον . . . καὶ ἔρχονται (iii and vii)	viii. 34 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ὑπάντησιν	viii. 35 ἐξῆλθον . . . καὶ ἦλθον
v. 22 καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων . . . ἰδὼν αὐτὸν . . . (iii and 455)	ix. 18 ἰδοὺ ἀρχων [εἰς] προσελθὼν (marg. εἰσελθων (? = εἰς ἐλθὼν), om. προσελθὼν)	viii. 41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ . . . ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς
v. 23 θυγάτριον (vii)	ix. 18 θυγάτηρ	viii. 42 θυγάτηρ
v. 27 ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ δχλῳ . . . ἤψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ († and i)	ix. 20 (and Lk. viii. 44) τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ	προσελθοῦσα . . . ἤψατο
v. 38 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον (iii and vii) <sup>1</sup>	ix. 23 καὶ ἑλθὼν ὁ 'Ι. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν	viii. 51 ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
v. 39 οὐκ ἀπέθανεν (ii)	ix. 24 (and Lk. viii. 52) οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν	viii. 54 κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς
v. 41 κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου (vii) <sup>2</sup>	ix. 25 ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς	iv. 16-22 . . . εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν . . . ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς . . . καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν . . . καὶ ἐθαύμαζον . . . καὶ ἔλεγον
vi. 2 ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήθισοντο λέγοντες <sup>3</sup>	xiii. 54 . . . ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν, ὥστε ἐκπλήθισσεν αὐτοὺς καὶ λέγειν, . . .	iv. 23 καὶ εἶπεν . . . εἶπεν δὲ . . . (?)
vi. 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν (v) (?) (vi)	xiii. 57 ὁ δὲ 'Ι. εἶπεν	xiii. 22 κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας
vi. 6 τὰς κώμας κύκλω (†)	ix. 35 τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας	ix. 1-6 συνακαλεσάμενος δὲ . . . ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ (?) πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι . . . ἐξερχόμενοι . . . τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης . . . τὸν κοινορτὸν . . . ἀποτινάσσετε . . .
vi. 7-13 καὶ προσκαλεῖται . . . ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν . . . καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων . . . ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν . . . καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν, καὶ δαιμόνια . . . ἐξέβαλλον . . . καὶ ἐθεράπευον. (†) (iii) (vii) <sup>4</sup>	x. 1-14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος . . . ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν (?) πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ (?) πᾶσαν μαλακίαν . . . ἀπέστειλεν . . . κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι "Ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν . . . δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε . . . ἐξερχόμενοι	

<sup>1</sup> Mk. v. 38. Since "house," rather than "home," is here intended, οἰκία is more suitable than οἶκος.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. v. 41. The repetition of "child" immediately after the use of the word in the preceding verse is not necessary for clearness, and the noun might be corrected to the pronoun as an improvement of style.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. vi. 2. The styles are here curiously reversed. Mk. has a participle, Mt.-Lk. καί. But considering the length of the Lk. extract the similarities in Mt.-Lk. are very slight.

<sup>4</sup> Mk. vi. 7. As in Mk. v. 2, 13, Lk. avoids πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. Mk. avoids νόσος (302), the regular Gk. for "disease."

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
	. . . τῆς πόλεως ἐκεῖνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτόν	διήρχοντο . . . καὶ θερα- πεύοντες πανταχοῦ
vi. 8 εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πῆραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν, (†) (vii) <sup>1</sup>	x. 9, 10 . . . χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον, μηδὲ χαλ- κὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μὴ πῆραν . . . μηδὲ ῥάβδον	ix. 3 . . . μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πῆραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον, . . .
vi. 14 ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἑρώ- δης (†)	xiv. 1 (Lk. ix. 7) Ἑρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης	
vi. 16 Ἐλεγεν (v)	xiv. 2 εἶπεν	ix. 9 εἶπεν
vi. 31-34 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοὶ καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν. καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν. καὶ εἶδαν αὐτοὺς ὑπάγον- τας καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί, καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς. . . καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά (†)	xiv. 13, 14 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰ. ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων . . . καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν	ix. 10, 11 καὶ παραλα- βὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλου- μένην Β. οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ . . . τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο
vi. 35 καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης (vi)	xiv. 15 ὥρας δὲ γενο- μένης . . .	ix. 12 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν
vi. 36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα . . . ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν (i and vii) <sup>2</sup>	xiv. 15 . . . ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα . . . ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώ- ματα <sup>2</sup>	ix. 12 . . ., ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα . . . κατα- λύσωσιν καὶ εὖρωσιν ἐπι- σιτισμόν
vi. 37 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ (or vi. 38 καὶ γνόντες λέγουσιν) (†) (vi)	xiv. 17 Οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ . . . Οὐκ ἔχομεν	ix. 13 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Οὐκ εἰσὶν . . . εἰ μήτι . . . ἀγοράσωμεν . . . βρώ- ματα <sup>2</sup>
vi. 41 . . . ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν (i)	xiv. 19 . . . ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις	ix. 16 ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθη- ταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ
vi. 43 κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα (†)	xiv. 20 τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις	ix. 17 τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινος δώδεκα

<sup>1</sup> Mk. vi. 8. The precepts about "saluting," "shoes" (but see 390 (ii) (ε) α), "the labourer," etc., are omitted because, though Mt. and Lk. both have them, Lk. does not place them here, but in the Sending of the Seventy. They form part of the Double Tradition.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. vi. 36 τί φάγωσιν, "what to eat," corrected into "food" here by Mt., later on by Lk. ix. 13, probably independently. The correction is a very natural one.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
vi. 44 (om. ὥσε!) (vii)	xiv. 21 ὥσε! <sup>1</sup>	ix. 14 ὥσε!
viii. 11 σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (vii)	xvi. 1 σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	xi. 16 σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
viii. 12 τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον (†)	xvi. 4 γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῶνᾶ (Mt. xii. 39 adds τοῦ προφήτου)	xi. 29 . . . ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστίν· σημεῖον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῶνᾶ
viii. 14 ἐπελάβοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους . . . καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ . . . (†) (and i)	xvi. 5, 6 ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ . . . ἐπελάβοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν . . . εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσ- <b>έχετε ἀπὸ</b> . . .	xii. 1 . . . ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον, <b>Προσέχετε</b> ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ . . .
viii. 28 ὅτι Ἰωάννην . . . , καὶ ἄλλοι . . . (vi)	xvi. 14 οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην . . . , ἄλλοι δὲ	ix. 19 Ἰωάννην . . . , ἄλλοι δὲ . . .
viii. 29 ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Π. λέγει αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός· (†) (also ii and v)	xvi. 16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σ. Π. εἶπεν, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος	ix. 20 Π. δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ
viii. 31 πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ <sup>2</sup>	xvi. 21 πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ . . .	ix. 22 πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ . . .
viii. 31 μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι (†)	xvi. 21 (Lk. ix 22) τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι	
viii. 36 τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ (mg. ὠφελήσει τὸν) ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι . . . καὶ (vi and vii)	xvi. 26 τί γὰρ ὠφελή- θῆσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐὰν . . . κερδῇσιν, τὴν δὲ . . .	ix. 25 τί γὰρ ὠφελείται (mg. ὠφελεῖ) ἄνθρωπος κερδῆσας . . . ἑαυτὸν δὲ . . .
ix. 2 . . . μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν (†)	xvii. 2 . . . μετεμορ- φώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος . . .	ix. 29 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεῖχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον
ix. 4 καὶ ὥφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡ. σὺν Μ., καὶ ἦσαν συνα- λῶντες (455, vii)	xvii. 3 καὶ Ἰσοῦ ὥφθη αὐτοῖς Μ. καὶ Ἡ. συνα- λῶντες μετ' αὐτοῦ	ix. 30 καὶ Ἰσοῦ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ· οἵτινες ἦσαν Μ. καὶ Ἡ. . . . οἱ ὀφθέντες . . .
ix. 5 λέγει (v)	xvii. 4 εἶπεν	ix. 33 εἶπεν
ix. 6 οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ (†)	xvii. 5 ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦν- τος,	ix. 34 ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος
ix. 6 ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγέν- οντο <sup>3</sup> (vii)	xvii. 6 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα	ix. 34 ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mk. vi. 44. Mt. xiv. 21, Lk. ix. 14 ὥσε! is a correction for style: the writers do not bind themselves to the exact number of "five thousand."

<sup>2</sup> Mk. viii. 31. Comp. 1 K. ix. 20 (A) ὑπὸ = 2 Chr. viii. 4 ἀπό, Lev. xxvi. 43 ὑπ' (B a b f ἀπ') αὐτῶν.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. ix. 6. "Ἐκφοβος occurs in N.T. only here, and Hebr. xii. 21 "Moses said, *I exceedingly fear and quake*," ἐκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἐντρομος, where the writer is referring to the words of Moses in Deut. ix. 19 "I was afraid of" (ἦν φόβος), ἐκφοβός εἰμι," where the object is "the anger and hot displeasure" of the Lord. As ἐκφοβος occurs here alone in Heb. LXX (and only once in



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
ix. 7 φωνή . . . Οὗτος (vii) <sup>1</sup>	xvii. 5 φωνή . . . λέ- γουσα, Οὗτος	ix. 35 φωνή . . . λέ- γουσα, Οὗτος
ix. 17 . . . ἀπεκρίθη . . . Διδάσκαλε (vii) <sup>1</sup>	xvii. 14, 15 προσῆλθεν . . . γουνπετῶν καὶ λέγων, Κύριε . . . ὅτι	ix. 38 ἐβόησεν λέγων, Διδάσκαλε, . . . ὅτι
ix. 18 οὐκ ἴσχυσαν <sup>2</sup>	xvii. 16 οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι	ix. 40 καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη- σαν
ix. 19 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει, Ὡ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, . . . φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με. (†) (v)	xvii. 17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰ. εἶπεν, Ὡ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διστραμμένη . . . φέρετέ μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε	ix. 41 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησ. εἶπεν, Ὡ γενεὰ ἄπισ- τος καὶ διστραμμένη, . . . προσάγαγε ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου
ix. 27 ἀνέστη(οιμ. ὁ παῖς) (i)	xvii. 18 ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς	ix. 42 ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα
ix. 29 . . . <sup>3</sup>	xvii. 20 . . .	xvii. 6 . . .
ix. 30 κάκειθεν ἐξελ- θόντες (vi)	xvii. 22 συστρεφόμενον δὲ αὐτῶν	ix. 43 πάντων δὲ θαν- μαζόντων
ix. 31 ἔλεγεν (v)	xvii. 22 εἶπεν	ix. 43 εἶπεν
ix. 31 παραδίδοται (†)	xvii. 22 μᾶλλι . . . παραδίδοσθαι	ix. 44 μᾶλλι παραδί- δοσθαι
ix. 35 εἰ τις θέλει πρῶ- τος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἑσχατος καὶ πάντων διδά- σκος (†) (see 429 for fuller context)	xxiii. 11 ὁ δὲ μέλλων ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡμῶν διάκονος	xxii. 26 . . . ὁ μέλλων ἐν ἡμῖν γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν

non-Heb., 1 Macc. xiii. v), it may be taken as almost certain that Mk., in using this word, is drawing a parallel (probably drawn by the author of the Hebrew Gospel) between the disciples on "the Holy Mount" and Moses on Mount Sinai. But the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 18-24) deprecates such a parallel. And the verb *ἐκφοβεῖν* is almost always used in LXX (as on the single occasion (2 Cor. x. 9) where it is used in N.T.) of "searing" or "frightening away." Hence it is a bad word to describe holy or reverential fear: and hence in Hebr. xii. 23 some authorities (Alford gives, among others, Chr-mss<sup>2</sup> and Thirt.), and one or two inferior authorities here, have *ἐμφοβος* or *φόβος ἐκράτησεν αὐτοῦς* (Swete here gives "*εκφ.* (vel *ευφ.*)" as a v.r. of several MSS.). The difference of phrase and order in Mt. and Lk. shows that, in this case, they were not following the same Corrector of Mk. but obeying a general tendency. The verb transl. in Deut. ix. 19 *ἐκφοβος*, = in Jer. xxii. 25 *εὐλαβεῖσθαι*, Jer. xxxix. 17 *φοβεῖσθαι*, also *δεῖναι* (1), *σεῖναι* (1), and *δευλαβεῖσθαι* (1).

This early dislike of *ἐκφοβος* may have caused here not only an alteration of the word itself, but also of the connection. Mk. represents the fear as consequent on the apparition of Moses and Elias, Mt. as following the voice from heaven, Lk. says expressly, "they feared *when they entered into the cloud*."

<sup>1</sup> Mk. ix. 7 and ix. 17. *λέγουσα*, or *λέγων*, softens abruptness, but in Mt. xvii. 14 the construction is changed so that *λέγων* becomes necessary. Comp. Mk. i. 11 *φωνή* . . ., Σὺ εἰ . . ., Mt. iii. 17 *φωνή* . . . *λέγουσα*, Οὗτος . . ., Lk. iii. 22 *φωνή* . . . *γενέσθαι*, Σὺ εἰ . . .

The agreement of *ὅτι* in Mt. xvii. 15, Lk. ix. 38 is probably a coincidence, the context being different. The former has "*Because* he is lunatic"; the latter "*Because* he is my only son."

<sup>2</sup> Mk. ix. 18: comp. Ezr. x. 13 "we are not able (נָא יָכֵל)," οὐκ ἔστιν δύναμις = 1 Esdr. ix. 11 οὐκ ἰσχύσομεν.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. ix. 29. The parallel Mt. xvii. 20, in answer to the question "Why could not we cast him out?" gives an answer (entirely different from Mk.'s) mentioning "faith as a grain of mustard-seed" and a "mountain." Lk. does not give the question about "casting out": but, in a different part of the Gospel, Lk. xvii. 6 mentions "faith as a grain of mustard-seed" in connection with a "sycamine tree" and "forgiving." This is not an "agreement against Mk."



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
ix. 50 ἀναλον γένηται (†)	v. 13 μωρανθῇ	xiv. 34 μωρανθῇ
x. 1 καὶ ἐκείθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (†)	xix. 1 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν . . . μετῆρεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰου- δαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου	xvii. 11 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι . . . διήρ- χετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας
x. 11, 12 ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ . . . μοιχᾶται . . . καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα . . . γαμήσῃ ἄλλον, μοιχᾶται <sup>1</sup>	xix. 9 ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ . . . μοιχᾶται . . . v. 32 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων . . . μοιχευθῆναι . . . ἀπολελυμένην	xvi. 18 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων . . . μοιχεύει . . . ἀπο- λελυμένην
x. 14 ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά (ii)	xix. 14 ἄφετε τὰ παιδία καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἔλθεῖν πρὸς με	xviii. 16 ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά
x. 21 ἐν οὐρανῷ (viii)	xix. 21 ἐν οὐρανοῖς	xviii. 22 ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρα- νοῖς
x. 22 στιγνᾶσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ (†)	xix. 22 ἀκούσας . . . τὸν λόγον [τοῦτον]	xviii. 23 ἀκούσας ταῦτα
x. 23 καὶ περιβλεψάμε- νος ὁ Ἰ. λέγει (v and vi)	xix. 23 ὁ δὲ Ἰ. εἶπεν . . .	xviii. 24 ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν [ὁ] Ἰ. εἶπεν . . .
x. 25 διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον . . . εἰσελθεῖν (†)	xix. 24 διὰ τρήματος ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλού- σιον . . . (marg. διὰ τρυ- πήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν)	xviii. 25 . . . διὰ τρή- ματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον . . . εἰσελθεῖν
x. 26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο (†)	xix. 25 ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο . . .	xviii. 26 εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες
x. 27 ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰ. λέγει, (ii and v)	xix. 26 ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰ. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	xviii. 27 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν,
x. 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν . . . ἠκολουθήκαμεν (v and vii)	xix. 27 (Lk. xviii. 28) εἶπεν . . . ἠκολουθήσαμεν	xviii. 29 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
x. 29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰ. (ii and i) <sup>2</sup>	xix. 28 ὁ δὲ Ἰ. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	xviii. 29 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
x. 30 ἑκατονταπλασίονα (†)	xix. 29 (Lk. xviii. 30) πολλαπλασίονα	xviii. 31 εἶπεν
x. 32 ἤρξατο . . . λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα (v)	xx. 17 εἶπεν	xviii. 31 εἶπεν
x. 34 μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται (see Mk. xviii. 31)	xx. 19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται (marg. ἀνα- στήσεται)	xviii. 33 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται
x. 42 καὶ . . . ὁ Ἰ. λέγει (v and vi) <sup>3</sup>	xx. 25 ὁ δὲ Ἰ. . . εἶπεν	xviii. 25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mk. x. 11, 12. As compared with Mt. v. 32, the difference between Mk. and Mt.-Lk. belongs to class iv: but Mt. v. 32 is part of the Double Tradition. Mk. x. 12 altogether differs from anything in Mt.-Lk. If we read Mk. thus:—καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασά τον ἀνδρα αὐτης γαμήσῃ ἄλλος (for ἀλλὸς) μοιχᾶται, the active γαμῶν will then be rightly used ("take to wife") and Mk. will agree with Mt.-Lk. With regard to Mt.-Lk. πᾶς, see above, note on Mk. iii. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. x. 29. Comp. also Mk. xii. 24, where Mt.-Lk. εἶπεν=Mk. ἔφη.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
x. 47 ἔστιν (†)	xx. 30 παράγει	xviii. 37 παρέρχεται
x. 51 ῥαββουνί (vii)	xx. 33 Κύριε	xviii. 41 Κύριε
xi. 1 ὅτε ἐγγιζουσιν (iii)	xxi. 1 ὅτε ἤγγισαν . . .	xix. 29 ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν . . .
xi. 1 ἀποστέλλει (iii)	xxi. 1 ἀπέστειλεν . . .	xix. 29 ἀπέστειλεν . . .
xi. 2 καὶ λέγει (iv)	xxi. 2 λέγων . . .	xix. 30 λέγων, . . .
xi. 2 λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε (†) (and iv)	xxi. 2 λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ μοι	xix. 30 καὶ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε
xi. 3 εἶπατε (vii) <sup>1</sup>	xxi. 3 ἔρεῖτε ὅτι	xix. 31 . . . οὕτως ἔρεῖτε ὅτι . . .
xi. 6 καθὼς εἶπεν (? i, but context different)	xxi. 6 καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς	xix. 32 καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
xi. 7 φέρουσιν (†) (and iii)	xxi. 7 ἤγαγον	xix. 35 ἤγαγον
xi. 7, 8 ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν (vi and vii)	xxi. 7, 8 ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ πλείστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ	xix. 35, 36 ἐπερίψαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰ. πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ὑπιστρώνοντες τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
xi. 9 καὶ (vi)	xxi. 9 δὲ	xix. 37 δὲ
xi. 9 ἔκραζον <sup>2</sup>	xxi. 9 ἔκραζον λέγοντες	xix. 37, 38 ἤρξαντο . . . αἰνεῖν . . . λέγοντες
xi. 18 καὶ (vi)	xxi. 15 δὲ	xix. 47 δὲ
xi. 19 καὶ ὅταν ὀφ' ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο (marg. ἐξεπορεύετο) ἔξω τῆς πόλεως (†)	xxi. 17 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἠύλισθη ἐκεῖ	xxi. 37 (in different context) ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἠύλιζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἑλαιῶν
xi. 22 Ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ (†)	xxi. 21 Ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν	xvii. 6 Εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν
xi. 28 ἔλεγον (iv or v)	xxi. 23 . . . λέγοντες	xx. 2 εἶπαν λέγοντες
xi. 29 ὁ δὲ . . . εἶπεν . . . Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἕνα λόγον, καὶ ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι (†)	xxi. 24 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ . . . εἶπεν . . . ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον ἕνα, ὃν εἰάν εἴπητέ μοι,	xx. 3 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν . . . ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον, καὶ εἰπατέ μοι
xi. 31 καὶ (vi)	xxi. 25 οἱ δὲ	xx. 5 οἱ δὲ . . .
xi. 32 ἀλλὰ εἰπωμεν . . . (†) (vii)	xxi. 26 . . . εἰάν δὲ εἰπωμεν	xx. 6 . . . εἰάν δὲ εἰπωμεν
xii. 1 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν (vii) <sup>3</sup>	xxi. 33 ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε	xx. 9 ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xi. 3. Mt.-Lk. prefer the future (to the imperative), perhaps as being less abrupt, and more suitable here, following a conditional clause. <sup>2</sup> Mk. xi. 9. See note on Mk. xiii. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xii. 1. "In parables" suggests that Jesus was on the point of uttering more parables than one, and is therefore corrected by Mt.-Lk. to the singular.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
xii. 2, 3 . . . ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶ- μος· καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν (i)	xxi. 34, 35 . . . λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ. καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοί . . .	xx. 10 ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρ- ποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δώσου- σιν αὐτῷ. οἱ δὲ γεωργοί
xii. 6 (omits) (ii)	xxi. 37 δὲ	xx. 13 δὲ
xii. 7 ἐκείνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἐαυτοὺς εἶπαν (†)	xxi. 38 οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς,	xx. 14 ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες
xii. 9 τί ποιήσει . . . ; ἐλεύσεται (†) (ii)	xxi. 40 ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ . . . , τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωρ- γοῖς ἐκείνοις ; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ . . .	xx. 15, 16 . . . τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς . . . ; Ἐλεύ- σεται . . . ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπαν . . .
xii. 11, 12 (omits)	xxi. 44 [καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον . . . W. H. bracket. <sup>1</sup> ]	xx. 18 πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν etc.
xii. 12 (simply 3rd pers. pl. "they") (i)	xxi. 45 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	xx. 19 οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς
xii. 15 φέρετε (vii) (see 449)	xxii. 19 ἐπιδέξασθε	xx. 24 δέξασθε
xii. 17 εἶπεν (i)	xxii. 21 . . . λέγει αὐτοῖς	xx. 25 . . . εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς
xii. 18 ἔρχονται . . . , οἷτινες λέγουσιν . . . , καὶ ἐπηρώτων (iii, iv)	xxii. 23 . . . προσήλθον . . . λέγοντες . . . , καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν	xx. 27 προσελθόντες δὲ . . . οἱ λέγοντες . . . , ἐπη- ρώτησαν
xii. 19 . . . καὶ κατα- λίπη γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῆ τέκνον (iv)	xxii. 24 μὴ ἔχων τέκνα	xx. 28 . . . ἔχων γυ- ναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἀτεκνος ᾤ, . . .
xii. 22 ἔσχατον πάντων καὶ <sup>2</sup> (vii)	xxii. 27 ὕστερον δὲ πάν- των	xx. 32 ὕστερον καὶ . . .
xii. 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή ; (ii)	xxii. 28 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν, τίνος . . . ;	xx. 33 ἡ γυνὴ οὖν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, τίνος . . . ;
xii. 24 ἔφη (? vii) <sup>3</sup>	xxii. 29 εἶπεν	xx. 34 εἶπεν
xii. 28 εἰς τῶν γραμ- ματέων . . . ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων ; (†)	xxii. 35, 36 ἐπηρώτησεν εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν νομικὸς πειρά- ζων αὐτόν, Διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ;	x. 25, 26 ἰδοὺ νομικὸς τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν, λέγων, Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας . . . κληρονο- μήσω ; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί . . . ; x. 27 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
xii. 29 ἀπεκρίθη (ii) <sup>4</sup>	xxii. 37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη	

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xii. 11. The words in Mt. are omitted by SS.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xii. 22 uses ἔσχατον as a preposition, a use not recognized in L. & S. but found in Deut. xxxi. 27, 29. That the scribes disliked it is shown by the largely-supported ἐσχάτη (comp. 2 Macc. vii. 41 ἐσχάτη δὲ τῶν υἱῶν ἡ μήτηρ ἐτελεύτησε). Mt.-Lk. adopt the more legitimate ὕστερον.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xii. 24. Comp. Mk. x. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Mk. xii. 29. In Mk. and Mt. the answer is made by Jesus, in Lk. by the lawyer.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
xii. 30 ἐξ ὧν τῆς καρ- δίας (ἐξ rep. 4 times) (? vii)	xxii. 37 ἐν, rep. 3 times	x. 27 ἐξ, once, ἐν rep. 3 times
xii. 35 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰ. ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ιερωῷ (i and vi)	xxii. 41 συνηγμένων δὲ τῶν Φ. ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰ.	xx. 41 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς,
xii. 36, 37 αὐτοὺς Δ. εἶπεν . . . λέγει . . . , καὶ πότεν . . . ; (ii and vii) <sup>1</sup>	xxii. 43-45 καλεῖ . . . λέγων . . . εἰ οὖν Δ. καλεῖ . . . , πῶς . . . ;	xx. 42-44 λέγει . . . Δ. οὖν . . . καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς . . . ;
xii. 38 καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν (+)	xxiii. 1 τότε ὁ Ἰ. ἐλά- λησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ λέγων	xx. 45 ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς,
xii. 38 θελόντων . . . περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς (+)	xxiii. 6 . . . φιλοῦσι δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν . . . καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς	xx. 46, 47 . . . θελόν- των περιπατεῖν . . . καὶ φιλοῦντων ἀσπασμούς
xiii. 2 ὅς οὐ μὴ κατα- λυθῇ (? vii)	xxiv. 2 . . . ὅς οὐ κατα- λυθῇσεται	xxi. 6 . . . ὅς οὐ κατα- λυθῇσεται
xiii. 3 καὶ καθημένον αὐτοῦ . . . ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν (vi) (? ii) <sup>2</sup>	xxiv. 3 καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ . . . προσῆλθον . . . λέγοντες	xxi. 7 ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγοντες
xiii. 5 (ἤρξατο) λέγειν (v)	xxiv. 4 εἶπεν	xxi. 8 εἶπεν
xiii. 6 πολλοὶ ἐλεύσον- ται (ii)	xxiv. 5 πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεί- πονται	xxi. 8 πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεί- πονται
xiii. 7 δεῖ γενέσθαι (ii)	xxiv. 6 δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι	xxi. 9 δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι
xiii. 8 ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοὶ (ii)	xxiv. 7 καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους	xxi. 11 σεισμοὶ τε μεγά- λοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ ἔσονται
xiii. 9 καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε (? viii) <sup>3</sup>	x. 18 καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε	xxi. 12 . . . ἀπαγο- μένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας
xiii. 11 . . . ἀλλ' ὁ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν . . . (viii) <sup>4</sup>	x. 19 δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν	xxi. 15 ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν . . .
xiii. 12 καὶ παραδώσει (vi)	x. 21 παραδώσει δέ	xxi. 16 παραδοθήσεσθε δέ . . .
xiii. 16 ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν (vii)	xxiv. 18 ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ	xvii. 31 ὁ ἐν ἀγρῷ
xiii. 18 ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψεις (vii)	xxiv. 21 ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλίψις	xxi. 23 . . . ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xii. 36-37 treats David's words first as a *past* fact and then as an extant and *present* saying. Mt.-Lk. prefer the *present* in both cases.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xiii. 3. Mt.-Lk. add λέγοντες here as in Mk. xi. 9, xv. 2. It tends to soften abruptness. Mt. omits "ask" as being implied in the following interrogative sentence, but adds his favourite προσῆλθον, a word that occurs in Mt. more frequently than in the whole of the rest of N.T.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xiii. 9 ἐπὶ with genit. is good Greek. Perhaps Mt.-Lk. are returning to the Hebrew. Mk. xiii. 11 has καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδίδοντες, which may be a conflate.

<sup>4</sup> Mk. xiii. 11. The same Hebrew ('2) means both "but" and "for."



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
xiii. 21 Ἴδε ὧδε . . . Ἴδε ἐκεῖ (vii)	xxiv. 23 Ἴδοὺ ὧδε . . . ἦ Ἰδε	xvii. 23 Ἴδοὺ ἐκεῖ ἦ Ἰδοὺ ὧδε (marg. om. ἦ)
xiii. 21 (omits) <sup>1</sup>	xxiv. 26 μὴ ἐξέλθῃτε	xvii. 23 μὴ [ἀπλῶς] διώξητε
xiii. 25 αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (viii)	xxiv. 29 αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν	xxi. 26 αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν
xiii. 30 μέχρι οὗ (vii)	xxiv. 34 ἕως [ἀν]	xxi. 32 ἕως [ἀν]
xiii. 31 οὐ παρελεύσονται (vii)	xxiv. 35 οὐ μὴ παρελ- θῶσιν	xxi. 33 οὐ μὴ παρελεύ- σονται
xiii. 35 γάρ (viii) <sup>2</sup>	xxiv. 42 ὅτι	xii. 40 ὅτι
xiv. 10 Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ, (vii)	xxvi. 14 ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης	xxii. 3 Ἰουδαντὸν καλοῦ- μενον Ἰσκαριώτην
xiv. 11 πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαί- ρως παραδοῖ (7 viii)	xxvi. 16 εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ	xxii. 6 εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν
xiv. 12 καὶ (vi)	xxvi. 17 δὲ	xxii. 7 δὲ
xiv. 13 καὶ λέγει (v and vi)	xxvi. 18 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	xxii. 10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν
xiv. 19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖ- σθαι (ii)	xxvi. 22 καὶ λυπούμενοι . . .	xxii. 23 καὶ . . . ἤρξαντο
xiv. 25 ὅτι οὐκέτι (†) (484-5)	xxvi. 29 οὐ . . . ἀπ' ἄρτι	xxii. 18 οὐ . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν
xiv. 29 ἔφη <sup>3</sup>	xxvi. 33 εἶπεν	xxii. 33 εἶπεν
xiv. 36 καὶ ἔλεγεν, 'Αββὰ ὁ πατήρ . . . ἀλλ' (iv and vii)	xxvi. 39 καὶ λέγων, Πάτερ μου . . . πλήν	xxii. 42 λέγων, Πάτερ . . . πλήν
xiv. 37 ἔρχεται (i)	xxvi. 40 ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς	xxii. 45 ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς
xiv. 38 ἔλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμὸν (vii)	xxvi. 41 εἰσελθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν	xxii. 46 εἰσελθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν
xiv. 43 καὶ εὐθὺς . . . παραγίνεται (iii and 485)	xxvi. 47 καὶ . . . ἰδοὺ . . . ἦλθεν	xxii. 47 ἰδοὺ . . . καὶ προήρχετο αὐτοῦς
xiv. 46 (omits) (†)	xxvi. 50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησ. εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐταῖρε . . .	xxii. 48 Ἰ. δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἰούδα . . .
xiv. 47 εἰς δὲ [τις] τῶν παρεστηκόντων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν (†)	xxvi. 51 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς . . . ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πατάξας	xxii. 49-51 . . . εἰ πατά- ξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τὴν εὐχρῆσιν αὐτῶν . . .
xiv. 53 καὶ ἀπήγαγον (vi)	xxvi. 57 οἱ δὲ κρατή- σαντες . . . ἀπήγαγον	xxii. 54 συλλαβόντες δὲ . . . ἤγαγον καὶ εἰσή- γαγον . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xiii. 21. The words in Lk. xvii. 23, if genuine, may be a conflate of διώξητε. Both are very natural additions. Possibly Mk. xiii. 21 (Mt. xxiv. 23) "do not believe it" (which Lk. omits) was in the Original "Do not be moved by it"; and some interpreted this of literal motion. Comp. Ezr. ix. 4 "trembled at (τῇ) the words," δεικνὼν λόγον=1 Esdr. viii. 69 ἐπεκινούνο τῷ ῥήματι.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xiii. 35. Γάρ is the Hellenic, ὅτι the Hebraic rendering, of "2."

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xiv. 29. Comp. Mk. xii. 24, x. 29.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
xiv. 54 καὶ ὁ Π. . . . ἡκολούθησεν . . . ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν . . . , καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος (†) (vi) <sup>1</sup>	xxvi. 58 ὁ δὲ Π. ἡκολού- θει . . . ἕως τῆς αὐλῆς . . . καὶ . . . ἐκάθητο	xxii. 54-56 ὁ δὲ Π. ἡκολούθει . . . περιπα- των δὲ πύρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ συγκαθισάντων, ἐκάθητο . . . ἰδοῦσα δὲ . . . καθήμενον
xiv. 61 σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; (†)	xxvi. 63 . . . ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.	xxii. 67-70 εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, εἰπὼν ἡμῖν . . . σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ;
xiv. 62 (omits) (†)	xxvi. 64 ἀπ' ἄρτι	xxii. 69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν
xiv. 65 . . . καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτευσον (†) (iv)	xxvi. 68 λέγοντες, Προ- φήτευσον ἡμῖν, Χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖσας σε;	xxii. 64 ἐπηρώτων λέ- γοντες Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖσας σε;
xiv. 66 οὐτος . . . κάτω (†)	xxvi. 69 ἐκάθητο ἔξω	xxii. 56 καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς
xiv. 68-70 οὐτε οἶδα οὐτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις . . . Οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν. 'Ο δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο . . . 'Αληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ (†) <sup>2</sup>	xxvi. 70-73 οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις . . . Οὗτος ἦν μετὰ 'Ιησ. τοῦ Ναζ. καὶ πάλιν ἠρνήσατο μετὰ ἄρκου ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἀνθρώπον . . . 'Αληθῶς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ	xxii. 57-60 οὐκ οἶδα αὐτῶν, γύναι . . . Καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ. ὁ δὲ Π. ἔφη, 'Ανθρώπει, οὐκ εἰμὶ . . . 'Εγ' ἀληθείας καὶ οὗτος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν
xiv. 72 ἀνεμνήσθη τὸ ῥῆμα (?) (vii)	xxvi. 75 ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ῥήματος	xxii. 61 ὑπεμνήσθη τοῦ ῥήματος
xiv. 72 ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκ- λαίεν (†)	xxvi. 75 ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς	xxii. 62 [ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς]
xv. 1 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ	xxvii. 1, 2 πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι	xxiii. 1 ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτόν

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xiv. 54: Mt.-Lk.'s agreement in the genit. αὐλῆς is only casual. Their meaning is different. The divergence of the four Evangelists here arises from a confusion (i) between αὐλή meaning "gate (γῡψ)" and "court (γῡν)," (ii) between ἔσω ("before") and πῶς (ἔ) ("inner"), and possibly (iii) between ἕως and ἔσω.

(i) Comp. Est. ii. 19, iii. 2 "the king's gate (γῡψ)" αὐλή, but Est. ii. 11 "before (ἔσω) the court (γῡν)" κατὰ τὴν αὐλήν, Est. vi. 10 "in the king's gate," LXX ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, but Lag. (a) ἐν τῇ πυλῶνι, Est. iv. 2 "He came even (ἔσω) before (ἔσω) the king's gate," ἦλθεν ἕως τῆς πύλης (Ἀ αὐλῆς), Est. iv. 2 "For none might enter within the king's gate," αὐλήν (κ α μακρ. πύλην).

(ii) Comp. 1 K. vi. 17 "before [it]" (Ἀ) ὁ ἐσώτατος (LXX om.), Est. v. 1 (lit.) "the court of the house of the king the inner (πῶς) (ἔσω)" εἰσελθοῦσα πάσας τὰς θύρας κατ' ἑστῆ ἐνώπιον (leg. ἔσω) τοῦ βασιλέως, Lev. x. 18 "... into the sanctuary within (πῶς); ye should certainly have eaten," εἰς τὸ ἅγιον· κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔσω φάγεσθε (confl. with ἔσω).

(iii) Comp. Lev. x. 18 "within," ἔσω (Ἀ ἔως), 2 Chr. xxix. 16 "came unto the inner-part of (πῶς) the house of the Lord," εἰσῆλθον οἱ ἱερεῖς ἕως εἰς τὸν οἶκον (no v.r.).

In Est. iv. 2 "He came even before the king's gate, for none might enter within," the LXX inserts "and stood [fast]" after "gate." In the same way probably, in the Gospels, John, taking the meaning to be "Peter came as far as the gate after him (ἵστημι) i.e. following Jesus [and there stopped]," has expanded the narrative, inserting a mention of "standing," substituting "door" for "gate," and conflating ἵστημι, "after him," as ἵστημι, "and another (disciple)": "And Simon Peter followed Jesus and [so did] another disciple . . . but Peter was standing at the door without."

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xiv. 68-70. The similarities are complex, see 404-8. Lk.'s καὶ σὺ might be regarded as parallel to Mk.-Mt.'s καὶ σὺ in the first denial. Also μετὰ is used by Mk.-Mt. in the first denial.

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
γραμματέων καὶ δλον τὸ συνέδριον, δήσαντες τὸν Ἰ. ἀπήνεγκαν (vii) (see 449)	τοῦ λαοῦ . . . καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον . . .	
xv. 2 ἐπηρώτησεν (ii) <sup>1</sup>	xxvii. 11 (ἐπ)ηρώτησεν . . . λέγων,	xxiii. 3 ἠρώτησεν . . . λέγων
xv. 2 λέγει (v, but ἔφη for εἶπεν)	xxvii. 11 ἔφη	xxiii. 3 ἔφη
xv. 5 (om. αὐτῷ after ἀπεκρίθη) (i)	xxvii. 14 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ	xxiii. 9 ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ
xv. 8, 9 καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ δχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς αἰετοῖ αὐτοῖς· ὁ δὲ Π. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων (?) viii)	xxvii. 17 Συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν εἶπεν	xxiii. 13 Π. δὲ συνκαλεσάμενος . . . εἶπεν
xv. 11 . . . ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Β. ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς (†)	xxvii. 20 ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Β., τὸν δὲ Ἰ. ἀπολέσωσιν	xxiii. 18 Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Β.
xv. 12 Mk. om. here, but see xv. 9 θέλετε ἀπολύσω (†)	xxvii. 21 (?) Τίνα θέλετε . . . ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν ;	xxiii. 20 (?) θῶν ἀπολύσαι
xv. 13 οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν (ii) <sup>2</sup>	xxvii. 22 λέγουσιν πάντες	xxiii. 21 οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες
xv. 14 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν <sup>3</sup>	xxvii. 23 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες Σταυρωθήτω	xxiii. 23 αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι (marg. σταυρώσαι)
xv. 14 ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Β. καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν (vi)	xxvii. 26 ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Β., τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν . . . παρέδωκεν	xxiii. 25 ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν δια στάσιν . . . τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν.
xv. 20 καὶ ἐξάγουσιν (iii) (see also 505)	xxvii. 31 καὶ ἀπήγαγον	xxiii. 26 καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον . . .
xv. 22 καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτόν (†)	xxvii. 33 καὶ ἑλθόντες . . .	xxiii. 33 καὶ ὅτε ἦλθαν . . .
xv. 24 σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν (†)	xxvii. 36 ἐθήρουν αὐτόν ἐκεῖ (?)	xxiii. 33 . . . (?) ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν
xv. 26 ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ . . . ὁ βασιλεὺς (†, and i or vii) <sup>4</sup>	xxvii. 37 ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν . . . Οὗτος ἐστὶν Ἰ. ὁ βασιλεὺς	xxiii. 38 ἦν δὲ . . . ἐπιγραφή ἐπ' αὐτῷ, Ὁ βασιλεὺς . . .   οὗτος

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xv. 2. Mt.-Lk. add λέγων as in Mk. xi. 9, xiii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Mk. xv. 13. As Mk. has not mentioned any "shouting" before, it might seem slightly inaccurate to describe the Jews as "shouting again." The original may have been "They said again and again," and Lk. may have expressed this by the repeated verb "crucify, crucify him" —which he alone has here.

<sup>3</sup> Mk. xv. 14. In the doubtful state of Lk.'s text, this can hardly be called an agreement of Lk. with Mt. Even if Mt.-Lk. agree in the passive, Lk.'s passive arises probably from interpreting something in the Hebrew original of Mk. as meaning "ask." The original of Mk. may have been "They cried aloud and lifted up (ἤνεον) [the voice] to crucify him," and Lk. may have read ἤνεον "and they asked." Or the original might have been "and they roared (ἤνεον)." <sup>4</sup> Mk. xv. 26. Comp. Mk. xv. 43 where Mt.-Lk. add ὁσως.



Mk.	Mt.	Lk.
xv. 30-32 σώσον σεαυτὸν καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ . . . ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ (†) <sup>1</sup>	xxvii. 40 σώσον σεαυτὸν· εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ	xxiii. 35-37 σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός· . . . εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰ., σώσον σεαυτὸν
xv. 32 καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι (vi)	xxvii. 44 τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησται	xxiii. 39 εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων
xv. 37 ἀφ' οἷς φωνῇ μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν (†)	xxvii. 50 κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα	xxiii. 46 φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ . . . εἶπεν . . .
xv. 39 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων . . . ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν (†) (also vii)	xxvii. 54 ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ . . ., ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γινόμενα, ἐφοβήθησαν . . . λέγοντες	xxiii. 47 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος τὸ γινόμενον, ἐδόξαζεν . . . λέγων
xv. 41 ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (†)	xxvii. 55 ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας	xxiii. 49 ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας
xv. 43 ἑλθὼν Ἰ. ἀπὸ Ἀ., εὐσχήμων βουλευτῆς (†)	xxvii. 57 ἦλθεν ἀνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀ., τ' οὐνομα Ἰωσήφ . . .	xxiii. 50 ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων
xv. 43 τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Π. καὶ ᾗτήσατο (†) (also iv and vii)	xxvii. 58 οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Π. ᾗτήσατο	xxiii. 52 οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Π. ᾗτήσατο
xv. 46 . . . καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν (†)	xxvii. 59 λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα . . . ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ . . .	xxiii. 53 καὶ καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ . . .
xvi. 1 καὶ (vi)	xxviii. 1 δὲ	xxiv. 1 δὲ
xvi. 1, 2 ἡγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι . . . καὶ . . . ἔρχονται (vii) <sup>2</sup>	xxviii. 1 ἦλθεν	xxiv. 1 ἦλθαν
xvi. 5 . . . περιβεβλημένος στολὴν λευκὴν (†)	xxviii. 3 ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπὴ καὶ τὸ ἐνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιτῶν	xxiv. 4 . . . ἐν ἐσθῇτι ἀστραποποίηση
xvi. 6 . . . λέγει . . ., Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· (v and vii) <sup>3</sup>	xxviii. 5 . . . εἶπεν . . . Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς	xxiv. 5 ἐμφόβων δὲ γενομένων . . . εἶπαν, . . . τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ (?) τῶν νεκρῶν; . . .
xvi. 7 εἶπατε . . . καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι προάγει <sup>4</sup>	xxviii. 7 εἶπατε . . . ὅτι ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ (?) τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ προάγει . . .	xxiv. 9 . . . ἀπήγγειλαν . . . τοῖς ἑνδεκα . . .
xvi. 8 . . . οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν (†)	xxviii. 8 . . . ἑδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ	

<sup>1</sup> Mk. xv. 30. The speakers differ. See context.<sup>2</sup> Mk. xvi. 1, 2. The aorist ἡγόρασαν is perhaps to be rendered pluperf., and to be taken parenthetically. Mk.'s text raises many difficulties. Mt. omits all mention of the spices. Lk. removes Mk.'s difficulties. The agreement of Lk. with Mt. is merely casual.<sup>3</sup> Mk. xvi. 6. Θαμβεῖσθαι is in Mk. (3), ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι (4). Neither word occurs elsewhere in N.T.<sup>4</sup> Mk. xvi. 7. The words τῶν νεκρῶν occur in such different contexts that they cannot be said to constitute an agreement of Mt.-Lk. against Mk.



## APPENDIX II

### ORAL TRADITION

[545] AGAINST the pages that precede Appendix I., a friend, who kindly inspected them, raised the objection that they presuppose in the Synoptic Gospels a frequency of translational error unparalleled in the LXX and unwarrantable even on the hypothesis of translation. He forgot that the Synoptic text as a whole is not presented above, but only those parts of it (with their contexts) in which Matthew and Luke agree in deviating from Mark. Where two historians agree in deviating from a third with whom they generally agree, it ought to be obvious that a selection of the passages exhibiting the deviations cannot be fairly taken as indications of the average adequacy of any of the three writers.

And if, in some of these deviations, Matthew and Luke have been independently following a Corrector of Mark who endeavoured—sometimes successfully, sometimes unsuccessfully, sometimes altering Mark for the better, sometimes for the worse—to return to an original Hebrew version, then it is reasonable to suppose that in those particular passages errors would be rather numerous. That, at least, is our experience in the more difficult portions of the Old Testament, where mistakes of the LXX occur not singly but in groups, one lapse leading to a second, and that again, sometimes, to a third. Hence, on the hypothesis of translation, there is no reason to be surprised at the large proportion of errors apparent above in the Greek Synoptic text. If this work had been a commentary covering the whole, and not a selection dealing with such parts as are specially likely to have been obscure in the original, the proportion of error to accuracy would have been much smaller. Even as it is, it would be easy to point to passages in several books of the LXX where the errors are very much more numerous and serious—being indeed sometimes one mass of mistakes with hardly a vestige of the original—than in any passage alleged above from the Synoptists.

[546] There is also one cause of divergence, Oral Tradition, likely to be much more potent in the New Testament than in the Old. No doubt, the most ancient books of the Old Testament are composite documents in which, at the time of their composition, oral tradition played its part. But when a book was once received as having a unity of its own, and as being a part of "Scripture," it would be handed down comparatively unaffected by tradition. Paraphrases and comments and explanations might be accepted as such, but not as part of the text. Only the more recent and popular and non-authoritative books—such as the stories of Daniel and Esther, and the narrative of the rebuilding of the Temple—would be liable to serious modification. A solid work treating of ancient historical facts and statistics, like the books of Chronicles, might be let alone, though recent and non-authoritative; but the attractive story of the Three Children would invite amplifications; and a collection of detached sayings, such as the book of Proverbs—where arrangement might vary from the first, and where the sense might be obscured by brevity and by the absence of illustrative context—would be peculiarly liable to divergences.

[547] The probable influence of oral tradition on the Gospels is well illustrated by the glosses and quotations of the sayings of Ben Sira. Being written in Biblical Hebrew when that language was no longer spoken, many passages are re-written in New Hebrew by the glossers or quoters. Where a sentence is not re-written a single word is sometimes substituted in the margin, more modern perhaps, or (as it seemed to the scribe) more suitable than the corresponding word in the text. Or, in quoting from memory, later authors, from lapse of memory, may substitute one synonym for another without any intention of altering the original. Thus if the original precept was, "Inquire not into things too deep for thee," the quoters may ring the changes on "inquire," "question," "ask," "ascertain," or else on "deep," "secret," "hard," "difficult."

Another class of divergences is produced by difficulty in the original, arising either from obscurity of language or from apparent unseemliness in the thought, or from mere confusion of letters, or from any of these causes combined.

A whole treatise might be profitably devoted to the glosses and quotations of Ecclesiasticus. No more than two specimens of variation can be given below.

[548] The first instance deals with the warning above-mentioned against inquiring into "hard" or "hidden" things. It may have been suggested by the words of Deuteronomy "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong unto us and

our children."<sup>1</sup> It must be premised that the Hebrew for "too difficult, hard, etc., *for* thee" is literally "difficult, hard, *from*, or *than*, thee." Hence "[too] secret *for* thee [to discover]" might be interpreted as "secret *from* thee." The passage is Sir. iii. 21: the three quotations given below are from the Oxford edition p. xix; after the LXX version, comes the original Hebrew discovered subsequently to the Oxford edition and printed on p. 3 of the text of the Cambridge edition.

- (1) "Into that which is too difficult for thee do not inquire,  
Into that which is concealed from thee do not search."

(2) The next is a conflated version. It prefers the poetic form (בל) of prohibition:

- (a<sub>1</sub>) "Into that which is too great for thee inquire not  
Into that which is too hard for thee search not  
(a<sub>2</sub>) In(to) that which is too difficult for thee seek not knowledge (lit. know not)  
In(to) that which is concealed from thee ask not."

(3) The next version adopts the rhetorical "why?" frequently used in the Bible instead of the prohibitive "not." It also substitutes "deeper than Sheol" for "too hard for thee" or "concealed from thee":<sup>2</sup>

- "That which is too difficult for thee why shouldst thou seek to know  
(lit. why shouldst thou know)?  
That which is deeper than Sheol why shouldst thou search?"

(4) (LXX):

- "Things too difficult for thee seek not  
And things too mighty for thee search not."

(5) (The orig. Heb.):

- "That which is too difficult for thee do not inquire  
And that which is concealed from thee do not search."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxix. 29 "the secret things (הנסתרות)," τὰ κρυπτά. All the writers quoted below use this Hebrew word (and the LXX uses κρυπτά) not in the couplet quoted, but in that which follows the quotation (548d).

<sup>2</sup> Dr. C. Taylor (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1900, p. 573) says, and, no doubt, correctly, that this comes from Job xi. 2, with perhaps a reminiscence of Ps. cxxxix. 6. But the question remains whether the scribe may not have been influenced by a variant "ask," in the margin, the letters being identical with those of "Sheol." If so, there is a play on the words, and they mean "deeper than *Sheol*" or "too deep to *inquire into*."

<sup>3</sup> [548a]

- (1) בסתלא סכך אל תדרש  
בסכוסה סכך אל תחקר  
(a<sub>1</sub>) בגדול סכך אל תדרש  
בחוק סכך אל תחקר  
(a<sub>2</sub>) בסתלא סכך בל תרע  
בסכוסה סכך בל תשאל  
(3) פליאה סכך מה תרע  
עמקה סכך מה תחקר



[549] For students of the Gospels these variations have a peculiar interest because they suggest a possibility of throwing light on John's reasons for omitting or altering the utterance of the Baptist about Christ—recorded by all the Synoptists—"one *mightier* than I," and also on the question whether John may have intended to express the same Hebrew original in the curious Greek phrase rendered by the Revised Version "He was *before me*." It is possible that the Hebrew original (429 vi-vii) of the Synoptic Greek was capable of meaning either "He was my chief, or, elder," or else, "He was mightier than I."

[550] The next instance is a passage in which the meaning of the Hebrew of Ben Sira (vii. 1) is completely metamorphosed in the Greek, and both versions differ entirely from a version in New Hebrew

(1) (New Hebrew):

"Good to the evil thou shalt not work and evil will not reach unto thee."

(2) (LXX):

"Do not evil and surely no evil shall befall thee."

(3) (Orig. Heb.):

"Do not evil to thyself and evil shall not (?) overtake thee."<sup>1</sup>

(4) χαλεπώτερα σου μὴ ζητεῖ  
καὶ ἰσχυρότερα σου μὴ ἐξέταζε.

(5) פלאות כסך אל תדרוש  
ובכוח כסך אל תחקור

[548b] The quotation continues thus (Sir. iii. 22):—

(Orig. Heb.) בסם שהרשית התבונן  
ואין לך עסק בנסתרות

(Transl. Camb. Ed.) "What thou art permitted, think thereupon;  
But thou hast no business with the secret things."

(LXX) ἡ προσετάγη σοι, ταῦτα διανοοῦ·  
οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν σοι χρεῖα τῶν κρυπτῶν.

[548c] Why did the LXX (548a) prefer "too mighty for (ἰσχυρότερα) thee" to "concealed from thee"? Did the Greek translators prefer a version that kept the parallelism, instead of rendering כסך first "for thee" and then "from thee"? Perhaps also they were influenced by the rarity of the construction "conceal from" (Gesen. Oxf. בסם) and by the fairly frequent occurrence of the Biblical "too hard for." It is also possible that בכוחם may have been read as (Dan. xi. 6) בכוח "into that which is strength," taken as an irregular way of saying "into that which is strong," and then corrected into the regular קוח used in (2) a<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>1</sup> The quotation, preceded by the words "Ben Sira said the proverb," is in the Oxf. ed. p. xx, the original Heb. in the Camb. ed. p. 6:

(1) (New Heb.) מן לביש לא תעבר וביש לא יכסי לך

(2) (LXX) μὴ ποίει κακά καὶ οὐ μὴ σε καταλάβῃ κακόν.

(3) (Orig. Heb.) אל תעש לך רעה ואל ישיגך רעה

[550a] Comp. Sir. xii. 3, which in the LXX is "There is no good to him that *continueth* in evil," οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν τῷ ἐνδελεχίζοντι εἰς κακά (leg. as participle of (נונ) but the Camb. Heb. "There is no good in *giving-to* (נונ) the evil." This—taken as in the Hebrew—may have influenced the quoter of (1).

In (3), the Camb. Editors render ישיגך, with a query, "overtake thee." The hiph. of שוּג (for סוּג) in Job xxiv. 2 is used of "*moving back* boundaries." Here, it would seem that the word might mean "cause thee to *withdraw*, or, *give ground*."



[551] The saying of Ben Sira, as expressed in the original Hebrew "Do not evil *to thyself* and no evil shall overtake thee," if interpreted, as Epictetus would interpret it, of moral evil, is unexceptionable: but otherwise it might well cause difficulty and provoke alterations.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps some corruptions may have arisen from blending these words with others of Ben Sira, quoted above (550a), warning the reader not to do good to the evil: but (apart from such blending) the Hebrew text of the present passage might easily be corrupted so as to give the meaning adopted by the LXX, and (though less easily) that of the quotation in New Hebrew.

The LXX, by simply transposing the two letters of the Hebrew pronoun "to thyself"—a word often confused by the LXX, and once at least in this very way<sup>2</sup>—would produce the Hebrew for "all." But "thou shalt not do *all* evil" is the regular Hebrew idiom for "thou shalt not do *any* evil." This gives a sentiment unexceptionable in point of morality: and this the LXX has adopted.

The author of the New Hebrew version, by dropping the last letter of the pronoun "to-thee," that is, in effect, dropping "thee," might read the original Hebrew as meaning "Thou shalt not do —— *to* the evil." It might then seem an obvious necessity to insert "good" in the blank thus created in the sense:—obvious, at least to those who knew that Ben Sira had elsewhere taught his readers not to give to the evil.<sup>3</sup> This course the writer appears to have followed.

[552] These instances may help us to realise some of the less obvious influences at work in the first century to produce and modify those evangelic "narratives" written—as Luke's preface tells us—by "many" authors, whose works have all perished except two.

The important point is to disabuse ourselves of the notion that the earliest Evangelists would\* use much "editorial freedom," a phrase sometimes used to mean a licence to insert details not because they are true but because they are picturesque or edifying; to omit or modify other details because they seem to have an opposite tendency; and to alter for the mere purpose of embellishing. No doubt, the writers may have been unconsciously biassed to a very large extent by

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ps. xlix. 18 "Men praise thee when thou *doest well unto thyself*," where the Psalmist appears to condemn the action implied.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Zeph. iii. 19 "with all (לֹא), LXX, "in thee (ἐν σοί)" (leg. ἅμα), 1 S. ii. 16 "for thyself (לִי)," LXX "for thyself (αὐτῷ) from all," σκαυτὴ ἐκ πάντων, conflating לִי and כל.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that none of these versions represents what Ben Sira said. For by substituting רַע for נָח we should obtain "do not to a neighbour (לְרֵעִי) evil (רָעָה)": and this play on the double meaning of רַע ("evil" or "neighbour") would resemble Sir. x. 6 "For every wrong requite not evil (רַע) to a neighbour (לְרֵעִי) (sic)." Of two consecutive identical syllables, one is frequently dropped; and, apart from this, translators might regard "neighbour" as a superfluous repetition of "evil." To the instances given above (188 (ii)) of the frequent confusion of "evil" and "neighbour" add Sir. xiii. 21 "from evil to evil" (so Camb. Ed. and Syriac), LXX "by friends," ὑπὸ φίλων.

a desire that the records of Christ's acts and words should represent Him adequately as the Fulfiller of prophecy, the Messiah, and the Son of God: and this bias has shaped their narratives. But, so far as the preceding investigations have enabled us to form a judgment, we do not often find very early apocryphal evangelists, and never the canonical ones, deliberately inventing new traditions. It is generally possible to detect, even now, some basis of fact or ancient tradition for what appears at first sight to be a mere fiction: and it is a reasonable inference that if we had before us all the "narratives" of the "many" authors mentioned by Luke, and all the written interpretations of Matthew's Logia handed down by those who, as Papias says, "interpreted them each to the best of his ability," we should find the paucity of invention almost equal to the magnitude of accretion.

# INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

MATTHEW		MATTHEW		MATTHEW	
	PAR.		PAR.		PAR.
2. 8	456 (ii)	10. 26	373 (i), (ii)	17. 2	522 (i)-(iv) and (vii) ; 527
2. 20	334 <sup>b</sup>	11. 1	350, 438 (v) <i>c</i>	17. 3	352
3. 5	334 5	11. 11	429 (vi)	17. 5	417 <sup>a</sup> , 422-4
3. 11	336-42 (comp. 333)	12. 1	360 (i)	17. 11	426
3. 12	336-42 (comp. 333)	12. 4	361	17. 17	425, 425 (i), 449
3. 16	343, 455-6	12. 10	456 (ii) <i>a</i>	17. 22	426 8
4. 1	344 6	12. 14	466 (ε) (δ)	18. 1	431 (ii)
4. 1, 2	345-6	12. 15-21	397 <sup>a</sup>	19. 1	438 (i)-(v)
4. 13 15	438 (v)	12. 22-23	363 <sup>a</sup>	19. 3	466 (γ)
4. 18	347-9	12. 25	364-6	19. 22	392 <sup>a</sup> , 439-42
4. 21	347-9	12. 31, 32	367-9	19. 24	444 (i)-(ii)
4. 23	350	12. 38	466 (δ)-(ξ)	19. 25	443
4. 24	352	12. 39	408-12	19. 27	447 (iv)
5. 13	432-7 (i)	12. 43	390 (i) (α) <i>a</i>	19. 29	445-7 (iv)
5. 14	435-6	12. 47	531	20. 19	p. 170, comp. 418 and 488
5. 15	372-3	13. 5-6	378 <sup>a</sup>	20. 22	427
6. 19-20	390 (ii) (ε)	13. 9	459 (iii) <i>a</i>	20. 26, 27	429-31 (ii)
6. 24	318 (ii)	13. 10	370	20. 30	448
7. 28	438 (v) <i>c, d</i>	13. 19	370 (i)-371	21. 2	449
8. 2	351-2	13. 21	447 (iii) <i>a</i>	21. 7	449
8. 20	355	13. 22	390 (ii) (γ)	21. 17	390 (i) (δ), 450-3
8. 23	351	13. 31-32	374-80	21. 21	372, 454
8. 25	382-6	13. 35	366 <sup>a</sup> , 436	21. 24	456 (i)-(iv)
8. 27	357	13. 53	438 (v) <i>c</i>	21. 26	372, 454
8. 29	455-6	14. 1	391-3	21. 33	459 (iv)
8. 34	455-6	14. 12, 13	394-9	21. 38	457-8
9. 2	352, 354	14. 13	400	21. 40-42	459 (i) 61
9. 7-8	355-6	14. 14	401-3	22. 16	466 (ε) <i>a</i>
9. 11	357	14. 15	372	22. 18	466 (β)
9. 16	358	14. 17	403 (i)	22. 19	449
9. 17	359-60	14. 20	404-5	22. 28	459 (v)
9. 18	352, 455-6	15. 39	498 <sup>g</sup>	22. 34-36	462-9
9. 20	358	16. 1	466 (δ)-(ξ)	22. 45	459 (v)
9. 32, 33	363 <sup>a</sup>	16. 3	439, 466 (ε) <i>c</i>	23. 1	470
9. 35	359-90	16. 4	372, 406-12	23. 4	466 (η) <i>a</i>
9. 36	401-3	16. 6	413, 466 (ε)	23. 5-7	471-2
10. 1-14	390 (i) (α)-(ε), 390 (ii) (ε)	16. 14	487 (i) (β)-(γ), 487 (i) (ξ) <i>c</i>	23. 8-11	429-431 (ii)
10. 2-3	353	16. 16	414-7	23. 35	438 (v) <i>a</i>
10. 9-10	390 (ii) (α)-(γ), 390 (ii) (ε)	16. 21	418	23. 39	435 <sup>a</sup>
10. 10	390 (ii) (ε) <i>a</i>	16. 22	460 (iii) <i>a, c</i>	24. 6	425
		16. 27	428	24. 21	436
		16. 28	522 (ii) <i>a</i>		
		17. 1, 2	419-21		

# INDEX OF

## MATTHEW

	PAR.
24. 27	522 (ii)-(iv)
24. 36	361
24. 51	466 (e) c
25. 34	438
26. 1	438 (v) c
26. 29	455
26. 47	352-3
26. 48-50	473-7
26. 51	478-82
26. 63	372, 414-7, 483
26. 64	484 (i)-5
26. 67-8	486-93
26. 69	493, 494a-8
26. 70	494-8
26. 71	494-8
26. 72	494-8
26. 73	494-8
26. 74	494-8
26. 75	499-501
27. 2	449
27. 15	502 (i)
27. 16	502 (vi) c
27. 17	502-4
27. 20-22	502-4
27. 26	493b, 502 (v)
27. 31	505
27. 33	505
27. 35-6	506
27. 36	506, 506 (iii) b
27. 37	506 (i)-(iii)
27. 40	507-8
27. 42-3	507-8
27. 50	509-14
27. 54	415a, 514
27. 55	506a, 515-6
27. 57-8	517-9
27. 59	520-1, 527e
27. 61	498f, 506a
28. 2	527a-d
28. 2, 3	522 (i)-(iv), 523-7
28. 8, 9	528-33
28. 10	531
28. 16, 17	487 (i) (e)

## MARK

1. 5	334-5
1. 8	336-42, comp. 333
1. 10	343, 455-6
1. 12	344
1. 13	345-6
1. 16	347-9
1. 19	347-9
1. 22	438 (v) d
1. 26	387a
1. 38	389, 350, 390 (i) (γ)

## MARK

	PAR.
1. 39	350
1. 40	351-2
2. 3	352, 354, 449
2. 12	355-6
2. 14	418a
2. 16	357
2. 21	358
2. 22	359-61
2. 23	360 (i)
2. 26	359a, 361
2. 27	459 (iii) a
3. 6	466 (e) b
3. 7	397a
3. 10	362
3. 14	350, 394a
3. 14-18	363
3. 19-21	363a
3. 21-26	363b
3. 23	364-6
3. 28	387a, 409a
3. 28-9	367-9
3. 32	331
4. 5, 6	378a
4. 9	459 (iii) a
4. 10	370
4. 12	387a
4. 15	370 (i)-371
4. 17	447 (iii) a
4. 19	390 (ii) (γ)
4. 21	372-3, 459 (iii) a
4. 22	373 (i)-(ii)
4. 24	432a, 459 (iii) a
4. 26	459 (iii) a
4. 30	459 (iii) a
4. 30-32	374-80
4. 34	370b
4. 36	381
4. 38	352-5
4. 41	356, 387
5. 5	455-6
5. 14	455-6
5. 19	395 (i) a
5. 22	352, 455-6
5. 27	388
5. 37	515a
5. 42	387a, 418a
6. 6	389-90
6. 7	535a
6. 7-13	390 (i) (a)-(e), 390 (ii) (e)
6. 8	390 (ii) (a)-(γ), 390 (ii) (e)
6. 9	390 (ii) (e) a
6. 10	459 (iii) a
6. 11	369b
6. 14	391-3
6. 20	391-3

## MARK

	PAR.
6. 29-32	394-9
6. 33	400
6. 34	401-3
6. 37	372
6. 38	403 (i)
6. 43	404-5
7. 5	466 (e) c
7. 11	456 (iv)
7. 19	342
7. 20	459 (iii) a
7. 24	438 (ii) a
8. 8	405
8. 10	498g
8. 11	466 (δ)-(ξ)
8. 12	371a, 372, 406- 12
8. 15	413, 466 (e)
8. 21	459 (iii) a
8. 28	487 (i) (β) and (γ)
8. 29	414-7
8. 31	418
8. 38	428
9. 1	459 (iii) a
9. 2	419-21
9. 3	522 (i)-(iv), and (vii); 527
9. 4	552-3
9. 6	422-4, 540
9. 7	417a
9. 11	357a
9. 12	420
9. 19	425, 425 (i)- 449
9. 28	357a
9. 31	426, 8, 459 (iii) a
9. 34	431 (ii)
9. 35	429-31 (ii)
9. 48-9	434
9. 50	432-7 (i)
10. 1	438 (i)-(v), 466 (γ)
10. 2	466 (γ)
10. 10	466 (γ)
10. 22	392a, 439-42
10. 25	444 (i)-(ii)
10. 26	443
10. 28	447 (iv)
10. 29	446
10. 30	445-7 (iv)
10. 34	p. 170, comp. 418, 488a
10. 38	427
10. 43-4	429-31 (ii)
10. 46-7	445
10. 51	351b
11. 2	449
11. 7	449



# NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

MARK	
	PAR.
11. 11	452 <i>a</i> , 453
11. 17	459 (iii) <i>a</i>
11. 19	390 (i) (δ), 450-3
11. 22	372
11. 22-3	454
11. 29	456 (i)-(iv)
11. 32	372, 454
12. 1	459 (iv)
12. 7	457-8
12. 9-10	459 (i)-61
12. 13	466 (ε) <i>a</i>
12. 15	449, 466 (β)
12. 23	459 (v)
12. 26	487 (i) (β) <i>c</i>
12. 28	459 (vi), 461 <i>d</i> , 462-9
12. 32	459 (vi), 462-7
12. 34	459 (vi), 462-7
12. 35	459 (iii) <i>a</i>
12. 37	393 <i>a</i> , 459 (v)
12. 37, 38	470
12. 38	413, 459 (iii) <i>a</i> , 471-2
12. 40	472 <i>a</i>
12. 41	390 (ii) (δ)
12. 43	409 <i>a</i>
13. 7	425
13. 32	361
14. 19	535 <i>a</i>
14. 25	409 <i>a</i> , 485
14. 36	459 (iii) <i>a</i>
14. 43	352-3
14. 44-5	473-7
14. 47	478-82, 491 <i>b</i>
14. 51	515 <i>a</i>
14. 61	372, 414-7, 483
14. 62	484 (i)-485
14. 65	482 <i>c</i> , 486-93
14. 66	493
14. 67	494-8
14. 68	494-8
14. 69	479, 494-8
14. 70	479, 494-8
14. 71	494-8
14. 72	499-501
15. 1	449
15. 2	503 (i)
15. 6, 8	502 (i), (iv)
15. 7	502 (vi) <i>c</i>
15. 9	502-4
15. 10-11	503 (ii)
15. 11	502-4
15. 12	502-4
15. 15	490, 493 <i>b</i> , 502 (v)-(vii)
15. 20	505
15. 22	505

MARK	
	PAR.
15. 24-5	506
15. 26	506 (i)-(iii)
15. 32	507-8
15. 35	479
15. 37	509-14
15. 39	415 <i>a</i> , 479, 514
15. 40	506 <i>a</i>
15. 41	515-6
15. 42-3	517-9
15. 46	520-1, 527 <i>e</i> , <i>k</i>
15. 47	506 <i>a</i>
16. 1	527 <i>g-k</i>
16. 3, 4	527 <i>a-d</i>
16. 5	522 (i)-(iv), 523-7
16. 8	528-33
16. 10, 13	531
16. 14	487 (i) (ε) <i>a</i>

LUKE	
1. 3	456 (iii)
1. 19	479
3. 3	334-5
3. 11	390 (ii) (ε) <i>a</i>
3. 16-17	336-42, comp. 333
3. 21	455-6
3. 21, 22	343
4. 1	344
4. 2	345-6
4. 32	438 (v) <i>d</i>
4. 43	350, 389
4. 44	350
5. 2	347-9
5. 10	347-9
5. 12	351, 352
5. 18	352, 354
5. 20	497 <i>b</i>
5. 25-6	355-6
5. 30	357
5. 36	358
5. 37-8	359-60
6. 1	360 (i)
6. 4	361
6. 9	456 (ii) <i>a</i>
6. 11	466 (ε) <i>b</i>
6. 13-14	363
6. 17	362, 438 (v)
6. 42	466 (ε) <i>c</i>
7. 4	360 <i>a</i>
7. 21	360 <i>a</i>
7. 22	360 <i>a</i>
7. 28	429 (vi)
8. 6	378 <i>a</i>
8. 8	459 (iii) <i>a</i>
8. 9	370
8. 12	370 (i)-71

LUKE	
	PAR.
8. 13	447 (iii) <i>a</i>
8. 14	390 (ii) (γ)
8. 16	372-3
8. 17	373 (i)-(ii)
8. 18	432 <i>a</i>
8. 20	531
8. 22	381
8. 23-24	382-6
8. 25	387
8. 28	455-6
8. 35	455-6
8. 39	395 (i) <i>a</i>
8. 41	352, 455-6
8. 44	385
8. 55	418 <i>a</i>
9. 1-6	390 (i) (α)-(ε), 390 (ii) (ε)
9. 3	390 (ii) (α)-(γ), 390 (ii) (ε)
9. 5	369 <i>b</i>
9. 7	391-3
9. 10	394-9
9. 11	400-3
9. 13	372, 403 (i)
9. 17	404-5
9. 19	487 (i) (β) and (γ)
9. 20	414-7
9. 22	418
9. 26	425
9. 29	419-21, 522 (i)- (iv), 522 (vii); 527
9. 30	353
9. 32	422-4
9. 33-4	422-4
9. 35	417 <i>a</i>
9. 41	425, 425 (i), 449
9. 44	426-8
9. 45	527 <i>k</i>
9. 46	431 (ii)
9. 48	429-31 (ii)
9. 58	385
10. 4	390 (ii) (ε) <i>a</i>
10. 11	390 (i) <i>a</i> , 390 (i) (γ), 390 (i) (ε)
10. 25-28	462-9
10. 25 foll.	466 (η) <i>c</i>
10. 28	459 (vi)
10. 37	466 (η) <i>d</i>
11. 14	363 <i>a</i>
11. 16	466 (δ)-(ζ)
11. 17	364-6
11. 24	390 (i) (α) <i>a</i>
11. 29	372, 406-12
11. 45-6	466 (η) <i>a</i>

# INDEX OF

LUKE	
	PAR.
11. 51	438 (v) <i>a</i>
12. 1	413, 466 (ε)
12. 2	373 (ii)
12. 10	367-9
12. 46	466 (ε) <i>c</i>
12. 56	466 (ε) <i>c</i>
13. 9	466 (iv)
13. 15	466 (ε) <i>c</i>
13. 18, 19	374-80
13. 22	389-90
13. 35	465 <sub>a</sub>
14. 1	466 (β) <i>a</i>
14. 34	432-7 (i)
15. 25-32	429 (v)
16. 13	318 (ii)
16. 14	466 (β) <i>a</i> , 466 (γ)
16. 22	449
17. 6	372, 454
17. 11	438 (i)-(v)
17. 24	522 (ii)-(iv)
18. 23	392 <sub>a</sub> , 439-42
18. 25	444 (i)-(ii)
18. 26	443
18. 28	447 (iv)
18. 29	446
18. 30	445-7 (iv)
18. 32-3	488 <sub>a</sub>
18. 33	p. 170, cp. 418 <sub>a</sub>
18. 35-7	445
19. 24	479
19. 30	449
19. 35	449
20. 3	456 (i)-(iv)
20. 6	372, 454
20. 14	457-8
20. 15-17	459 (i)-61
20. 19	461
20. 20	466 (ε) <i>a</i>
20. 23	466 (β)
20. 24	449
20. 33	459 (v)
20. 39	459 (vi), 462-7
20. 44	459 (v)
20. 45	470
20. 46	471-2
20. 47	472 <sub>a</sub>
21. 1	390 (ii) (δ)
21. 9	428
21. 37	390 (i) δ, 450-3
22. 18	485
22. 26	429-431 (ii)
22. 28	480 <sub>b</sub>
22. 32	501 <sub>a</sub>
22. 36-38	450
22. 47	352-3
22. 47-8	473-7
22. 49-50	478-82

LUKE	
	PAR.
22. 49	491 <sub>b</sub>
22. 55	493 <sub>d</sub>
22. 56	493, 494-8
22. 57	494-8
22. 58	494-8
22. 59	494-8
22. 60	494-8
22. 61	459 (vi)
22. 61, 62	499-501
22. 63-5	486-93
22. 67-70	483-5
23. 1	449
23. 2	503 (i)-(ii)
23. 4	506 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 5	503 (i)-(ii)
23. 6-12	503 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 11	487 (i) (α)
23. 12	503 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 14	506 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 14-15	503 (iii)
23. 16	502-4
23. 18	502-4
23. 20	502-4
23. 22	493 <sub>b</sub> , see 502-4, 506 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 25	502 (v)-(vii), 503 (iii) <i>a</i>
23. 26	505
23. 33	505-6
23. 35	466 (β) <i>a</i> , 507-8
23. 37	507-8
23. 38	506 <sub>a</sub> , 506 (i)-(iii)
23. 46	509-14
23. 47	415 <sub>a</sub> , 514
23. 49	515-6
23. 50-2	517-9
23. 53	520-1, 527 <sub>e</sub>
23. 56	527 <sub>g-k</sub>
24. 1	527 <sub>g-k</sub>
24. 2	527 <sub>a-d</sub>
24. 4	522 (i)-(iv), 523-7
24. 9	487 (i) (ε) <i>a</i>
24. 9-11	528-33
24. 33	487 (i) (ε) <i>a</i>

## JOHN

1. 33	583
1. 34	417 <sub>a</sub>
1. 36	459 (vi)
1. 42	459 (vi)
1. 51	343
3. 16-21	342
3. 22	334 <sub>b</sub>
3. 31-6	342

JOHN	
	PAR.
6. 13	405
6. 15	397 <sub>a</sub>
6. 68-9	414, 417 <sub>b</sub>
7. 25	334 <sub>b</sub>
9. 8-9	487 (i) (γ)
11. 55	334 <sub>b</sub>
12. 6	527 <sub>f</sub>
12. 38	470
13. 27	477 <sub>a</sub>
18. 2	476
18. 5	476, 484 (i) <i>c</i>
18. 8	484 (i) <i>c</i>
18. 10	480
18. 17	404-8
18. 22	479, 487 (i) (α), 493 <sub>a</sub>
18. 23	493 <sub>c</sub>
18. 25	494-8
18. 26	496
18. 27	494-8
18. 30	503 (i) <i>a</i>
18. 33	503 (i) <i>a</i>
18. 38	506 (ii)
18. 39. 40	502-4
19. 1	493 <sub>b</sub> , 502 <sub>c</sub> (v)
19. 3	487 (i) (α)
19. 4	506 (iii) <i>a</i>
19. 6	506 (i) <i>a</i> , 506 (iii) <i>a</i>
19. 15	504 <sub>b</sub>
19. 16	487 (i) (α)
19. 19	506 <sub>b</sub> , 506 (i)-(iii)
19. 30	509 <sub>a</sub> , 514
19. 38-40	527 <sub>g-d</sub>
19. 40	521
20. 1	527 <sub>c</sub>
20. 7	521, 527 <sub>d</sub>
20. 9	527 <sub>h</sub>
20. 15	527 <sub>f</sub>
20. 18	531
21. 20	501 <sub>a</sub>

## ACTS

1. 5	538
1. 26	487 (i) (ε) <i>a</i>
2. 14	487 (i) (ε) <i>a</i>
3. 22	487 (i) (β) <i>d</i>
4. 13	317 <sub>a</sub>
5. 35	506 (i) <i>b</i>
7. 6	429 (ii)
10. 39	334 <sub>b</sub>
11. 16	338
11. 19	506 (i) <i>b</i>
12. 2	480 <sub>a</sub>
12. 8	390 (ii) (ε) <i>a</i>
13. 28	506 (i) <i>a</i>

# NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

## ACTS

	PAR.
13. 50	<b>519</b>
13. 51	<b>390 (i) a, 390 (i) (e)</b>
17. 12	<b>519</b>
17. 23	<b>506 (i)</b>
23. 2	<b>479</b>
28. 18	<b>506 (i) a</b>

## ROMANS

8. 29	<b>417</b>
9. 12	<b>429 (i)-(v)</b>
9. 12-31	<b>429 (v)</b>
10. 16	<b>470</b>
11. 20	<b>433a</b>
13. 4	<b>480a</b>
15. 19	<b>390d</b>

## I CORINTHIANS

1. 20	<b>465</b>
4. 11	<b>489a</b>
15. 6	<b>487 (i) (e) a</b>
16. 9	<b>343</b>

## 2 CORINTHIANS

2. 12	<b>343</b>
3. 7	<b>420</b>
3. 10	<b>420</b>
3. 15	<b>527h</b>
11. 19	<b>393a</b>
12. 7	<b>362a, 489a</b>

## GALATIANS

	PAR.
2. 9	<b>480b</b>
6. 9	<b>446</b>

## EPHESIANS

4. 3	<b>437</b>
6. 14	<b>390 (ii) (e)</b>
6. 15	<b>390 (ii) (e) a</b>

## PHILIPPIANS

2. 15	<b>435</b>
-------	------------

## COLOSSIANS

1. 15	<b>417</b>
1. 18	<b>417</b>
3. 15	<b>437</b>
4. 3	<b>343</b>

## I THESSALONIANS

5. 13	<b>437</b>
-------	------------

## 2 TIMOTHY

3. 9	<b>466 (e) b</b>
------	------------------

## HEBREWS

1. 6	<b>417</b>
3. 11	<b>371a, 408</b>
4. 3	<b>371a, 408</b>

## HEBREWS

	PAR.
4. 5	<b>408</b>
12. 6	<b>502 (v)</b>

## JAMES

5. 3, 4	<b>390 (ii) (e)</b>
---------	---------------------

## I PETER

2. 20	<b>489a</b>
2. 25	<b>501a</b>
5. 6	<b>446</b>

## 2 PETER

1. 19	<b>522 (iii) a</b>
-------	--------------------

## REVELATION

1. 5	<b>417</b>
1. 12-15	<b>522 (v)-(vii)</b>
1. 13	<b>390 (ii) (e)</b>
2. 18	<b>522 (vi)</b>
3. 4	<b>526a</b>
3. 8	<b>343</b>
3. 18	<b>390 (ii) (e)</b>
4. 1	<b>343</b>
4. 4	<b>526a</b>
7. 9	<b>526a</b>
14. 13	<b>485c</b>
16. 13, 14	<b>390 (i) (a) a</b>
17. 3	<b>449</b>
19. 14	<b>526a</b>
21. 10	<b>449</b>
21. 12	<b>506 (i)</b>

THE END





# BOOKS BY CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA BIBLICA, AND OTHERS

PUBLISHED BY A. & C. BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON.

ABBOTT, EDWIN A., M.A., D.D.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY: HIS DEATH AND MIRACLES.

In two volumes, demy 8vo, cloth. With a Photogravure Frontispiece. Price 24s.

'It is clear that I cannot say much of these six hundred and sixty large pages in the same number of lines. But I would commend them to students of the New Testament, to critics and theologians, as furnishing, with admirable candour, no small addition to their means of following out certain long-debated problems, until they arrive at a solution which shall be true to the evidence.'—*Bookman*.

CLUE: A GUIDE THROUGH GREEK TO HEBREW SCRIPTURE. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

This work aims at demonstrating that parts of the Synoptic Gospels are based upon a common original Hebrew document, not Aramaic, but Hebrew in the strict sense—'Biblical Hebrew.' The details of the demonstration are supported by quotations from the Hebrew and from the Greek translations of it, and are given in notes for 'the learned.' But the text contains neither Greek nor Hebrew, and appeals to the general reader. The author maintains that internal evidence 'can as absolutely and scientifically demonstrate translation from a Biblical Hebrew document as fossils in a rock can demonstrate the action of water'; and specimens are given of the manner in which it is proposed to ascend from the Greek Gospels to their Hebrew original, thus approximating to the Galilean Aramaic actually uttered by our Lord.

CHARLES, REV. PROFESSOR R. H., D.D.

THE APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH. Translated from the Syriac. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

'Mr. Charles's work will have a hearty welcome from students of Syriac whose interest is linguistic, and from theological students who have learned the value of Jewish and Christian pseudepigraphy; and the educated general reader will find much of high interest in it, regard being had to its date and its theological standpoint.'—*Record*.

THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES. Translated from the Latin Sixth Century MS., the unemended Text of which is published herewith, together with the Text in its restored and critically emended form. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d.

'In this admirable little book the Rev. R. H. Charles has added another to the excellent series of editions by which he has earned the gratitude of all students of early Christian literature.'—*Times*.

A CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE IN ISRAEL, IN JUDAISM, AND IN CHRISTIANITY; OR, HEBREW, JEWISH, AND CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY FROM PRE-PROPHETIC TIMES TILL THE CLOSE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (THE JOWETT LECTURES FOR 1898-99). In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 15s.

'If the Jowett Lectures rise always to this height, we shall receive a series of volumes which will rival in value any lectureship in existence. For this is a thoroughly capable treatment of perhaps the most difficult subject in theology.'—*Expository Times*.

CHARLES, REV. PROFESSOR R. H., D.D.—*Continued.*

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH: TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND COMMENTARY. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

In the above work all the existing textual materials have been critically edited—Greek, Ethiopic, Latin and Slavonic. Of these the Slavonic has hitherto been inaccessible to Western scholars, and the Greek has only been discovered within the past year. As regards the higher criticism of the book, the editor agrees with Ewald and Dollmann in recognising three independent writings underlying the 'Ascension.' In the more exact study of these sources he has discovered the hitherto missing 'Testament of Hezekiah,' which, dating from the close of the first century, is at once the oldest non-canonical Christian writing, and the earliest to attest the death of St. Peter at Rome. This source, and the third—the Vision of Isaiah (90–100 A.D.)—supply invaluable materials for the history of the early Christian expectation of the Antichrist, the second Advent, and other matters of belief and conduct.

CHEYNE, REV. PROFESSOR T. K., D.D.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF ISAIAH. WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE UNDOUBTED PORTIONS OF THE TWO CHIEF PROPHETIC WRITERS IN A TRANSLATION. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 24s.

'This elaborate and scholarly work. . . . We must leave to professed scholars the detailed appreciation of Professor Cheyne's work. His own learning and reputation suffice to attest its importance.'—*Times*.

'This truly great and monumental work.'—*Critical Review*.

'This monument of patient scholarship, wide reading, and indefatigable research.'—*Speaker*.

CONE, ORELLO, D.D.

PAUL: THE MAN, THE MISSIONARY, AND THE TEACHER. In one volume, post 8vo, cloth. Price 10s. 6d.

'One of the excellencies of Dr. Cone's work is that it is mainly exegetical. He denies himself the luxury of expanding Paul's positions either speculatively or experimentally. It may be presumed that no interpreter escapes from the influence of certain presuppositions, but in Dr. Cone there is, at any rate, an obvious attempt to be fair and unbiassed. His exposition of the teaching of St. Paul will stand comparison with any hitherto published, and will be found most instructive.'—MARCUS DODS in the *British Weekly*.

GARDNER, PERCY, LITT.D.

EXPLORATIO EVANGELICA: A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE BASIS AND ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN BELIEF. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 15s.

'Professor Gardner sets forth clearly, almost coldly—though the glow of an intense spiritual emotion is not wholly concealed—the things which belong to all religious experience, and which give religion a place in human nature which is incomplete without it. This is the constructive side of the book. . . . The importance of Professor Gardner's work is that it insists upon free historical criticism being carried out fully, or else wholly and avowedly rejected.'—*Guardian*.

GRAY, G. BUCHANAN, M.A.

STUDIES IN HEBREW PROPER NAMES. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

'These "Studies" may be warmly commended as a step in the right direction. They bring out into clear relief progress of religious ideas in Israel, and make an important contribution to the criticisms of Old Testament documents.'—C. H. TOY, Harvard University.

THE DIVINE DISCIPLINE OF ISRAEL: AN ADDRESS AND THREE LECTURES ON THE GROWTH OF IDEAS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 2s. 6d. net.

'The address and lectures are alike scholarly and thoughtful, and furnish a good specimen of the constructive criticism of the Old Testament, which is steadily being developed by the Higher Critics.'—*Guardian*.

## HAECKEL, ERNST.

MONISM, AS CONNECTING RELIGION AND SCIENCE: THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF A MAN OF SCIENCE. Translated from the German by J. D. F. GILCHRIST. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 1s. 6d. net.

'We may readily admit that Professor Haeckel has stated his case with the clearness and courage which we should expect of him, and that his lecture may be regarded as a fair and authoritative statement of the views now held by a large number of scientifically educated people.'—*Times*.

## HARNACK, PROFESSOR ADOLF.

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY. Translated, with the Author's sanction, by THOMAS BAILEY SAUNDERS, with an Introductory Note. Second Edition. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 1s. 6d. net.

'It is highly interesting and full of thought. The short introductory note with which Mr. Saunders prefaces it is valuable for its information and excellent in its tone.'—*Athenæum*.

THOUGHTS ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF PROTESTANTISM. Translated by THOMAS BAILEY SAUNDERS. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 1s. 6d. net.

This is a version of a recent utterance on the question at issue between the Catholic and the Protestant by the most distinguished German theologian now living. Professor Harnack treats of this question in a brief compass, and with a breadth of view and vigour of expression which must make what he says interesting to readers of every shade of opinion.

SOURCES OF THE APOSTOLIC CANONS. WITH A TREATISE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE READERSHIP AND OTHER LOWER ORDERS. Translated by LEONARD A. WHEATLEY. With an Introductory Essay on the Organisation of the Early Church and the Evolution of the Reader by the Rev. JOHN OWEN, Author of "Evenings with the Skeptics." In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

'The wide circulation of this volume would be of the happiest augury, for a more scientific and worthy conception of the organization of the primitive Church.'—Dr. MARCUS DODS in *The Bookman*.

THE APOSTLES' CREED. Translated by THOMAS BAILEY SAUNDERS. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 1s. 6d. net.

## PFLEIDERER, OTTO, D.D.

EVOLUTION AND THEOLOGY. Edited by DR. ORELLO CONE, Lombard University. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 5s. net.

In collecting and publishing these essays, with the permission of the distinguished author, the editor has been actuated by a desire to place before English readers, in a convenient form, some of the occasional writings of one of the foremost theologians and scholars of this century.

Some of Dr. Pfleiderer's larger works have already appeared in English translations, and of the essays composing this volume, several have been published in Quarterly Reviews issued in the United States. The rest now appear in English for the first time.

## SABATIER, A., D.D.

(DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY, PARIS.)

THE VITALITY OF CHRISTIAN DOGMAS, AND THEIR POWER OF EVOLUTION: A STUDY IN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY. Translated by Mrs. EMMANUEL CHRISTEN. With a Preface by the Very Rev. the Hon. W. H. FREMANTLE, D.D., Dean of Ripon. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 1s. 6d. net.

'Dr. Sabatier has rendered a good and timely service, alike to theology and religion, by discussing, as he does here, the relation in which dogma stands to the reality of religious feeling and experience.'—*Glasgow Herald*.



## SCHECHTER, S., M.A.

STUDIES IN JUDAISM. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d.

'He lifts the veil, and we get a glimpse of Jewish teachers and revivalists, of Jewish philosophy and mysticism, and above all of Jewish devotion to the Torah. Read the article on the Chassidim, and you will find a community the like of which we have never been taught to expect in Israel. The contrast of the fine spirit of Israel Baalshem and the extraordinary perversion of his teaching by his followers, is at once enlightening and pathetic. . . . The book is written throughout in a vigorous clear style with constant flashes of sly humour, and it will, we have no doubt, find multitudes of readers who will endorse our verdict in thanking Mr. Schechter for a most interesting and delightful piece of work.'—*Cambridge Review*.

SMITH, the late W. ROBERTSON, M.A., LL.D.

LECTURES ON THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES, THE FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTIONS. New Edition, revised throughout by the Author. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 15s. net.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH CHURCH: A COURSE OF LECTURES ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM. Second Edition, revised and much enlarged. In one volume, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 10s. 6d.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL, AND THEIR PLACE IN HISTORY TO THE CLOSE OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C. With Introduction and additional Notes by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. Second Edition. In one volume, large crown 8vo, cloth. Price 10s. 6d.

WARD, JAMES, SC.D., HON. LL.D. EDIN.

NATURALISM AND AGNOSTICISM: THE GIFFORD LECTURES OF 1896-98. In two volumes, demy 8vo, cloth. Price 18s. net.

'It cannot be doubted that it will have a wide influence on the higher thought of the country, and may even do something to restore to Philosophy the pre-eminent place it once occupied in English thought.'—*Athenæum*.

WELLHAUSEN, PROFESSOR J.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH. Third Edition. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 5s.

'A sketch which has created such widespread and profound interest as this could not be kept in the pages of a voluminous encyclopædia. Wellhausen's words necessarily have exceptional importance, even in the esteem of those who differ from him *to toto caelo*.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

WRIGHT, the late WILLIAM, LL.D.

A SHORT HISTORY OF SYRIAC LITERATURE. In one volume, crown 8vo, cloth. Price 6s.

'A masterly account of the literature written in that language. It may safely be said that there is no one in England—or even in Europe—at the present time capable of speaking with anything like his authority in matters appertaining to Syriac literature.'—*Record*.

A. & C. BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON.







New Testament

138791

Bible

Comment(N.T.)

Author Abbott, E.A.

A

Title Diatessarica. Pt.2.

DATE

NAME OF BORROWER

Oct 20 1936 0477

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY

Do not  
remove  
the card  
from this  
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

